THE HISTORY OF THE POPES, FROM THE Foundation of the SEE of *ROME*, TO THE PRESENT TIME.

VOL. I.

By ARCHIBALD BOWER, *Esq*;
Heretofore Public Professor of Rhetoric, History, *and* Philosophy, *in the Universities of* Rome, Fermo, *and* Macerata,
And, in the latter Place, Counsellor of the Inquisition.

DUBLIN:
Printed by GEORGE FAULKNER, in Essex-Street.
MDCCXLIX.

BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA

A

LIST

OF THE

Popes, *or* Biſhops *of* ROME,

Contained in the

FIRST VOLUME.

	Year of Chriſt.	Page
ST. PETER, - - - -		1
LINUS, *Firſt Biſhop of* Rome, -	66	11
CLETUS, *or* ANACLETUS, *Second Biſhop*,	78	15
CLEMENT, *Third Biſhop*, - - -	91	18
EVARISTUS, *Fourth Biſhop*, - -	100	27
ALEXANDER, *Fifth Biſhop*, - -	109	28
SIXTUS, *Sixth Biſhop*, - - - -	119	29
TELESPHORUS, *Seventh Biſhop*, - -	128	30
HYGINUS, *Eighth Biſhop*, - - -	139	31
PIUS, *Ninth Biſhop*, - - - - -	142	32
ANICETUS, *Tenth Biſhop*, - - -	157	35
SOTER, *Eleventh Biſhop*, - - -	168	38
ELEUTHERIUS, *Twelfth Biſhop*, - -	176	39
VICTOR, *Thirteenth Biſhop*, - - -	192	46
ZEPHYRINUS, *Fourteenth Biſhop*, -	219	52
CALLISTUS, *Fifteenth Biſhop*, - -	*ibid.*	56
URBANUS,		

	Year of Christ.	Page
URBANUS, *Sixteenth Biſhop*, - -	223	59
PONTIANUS, *Seventeenth Biſhop*, -	230	60
ANTERUS, *Eighteenth Biſhop*, - -	235	62
FABIANUS, *Nineteenth Biſhop*, - -	236	63
CORNELIUS, *Twentieth Biſhop*, - -	251	67
LUCIUS, *Twenty-firſt Biſhop*, - -	252	80
STEPHEN, *Twenty-ſecond Biſhop*, - -	253	82
SIXTUS II. *Twenty-third Biſhop*, -	257	96
DIONYSIUS, *Twenty-fourth Biſhop*, -	258	98
FELIX, *Twenty-fifth Biſhop*, - - -	269	104
EUTYCHIANUS, *Twenty-ſixth Biſhop*,	275	*ibid.*
CAIUS, *Twenty-ſeventh Biſhop*, - -	283	105
MARCELLINUS, *Twenty-eighth Biſhop*,	296	106
MARCELLUS, *Twenty-ninth Biſhop*, -	308	112
EUSEBIUS, *Thirtieth Biſhop*, - -	310	114
MELCHIADES, *Thirty-firſt Biſhop*, -	311	115
SYLVESTER, *Thirty-ſecond Biſhop*, -	314	125
MARK, *Thirty-third Biſhop*, - -	336	152
JULIUS, *Thirty-fourth Biſhop*, - -	337	153
LIBERIUS, *Thirty-fifth Biſhop*, - -	352	168
DAMASUS, *Thirty-ſixth Biſhop*, - -	366	238
SYRICIUS, *Thirty-ſeventh Biſhop*, -	384	311
ANASTASIUS, *Thirty-eighth Biſhop*, -	398	370
INNOCENT, *Thirty-ninth Biſhop*, - -	402	386
ZOSIMUS, *Fortieth Biſhop*, - - -	417	439
BONIFACE, *Forty-firſt Biſhop*, - -	419	477
CELESTINE, *Forty-ſecond Biſhop*, - -	422	488

THE

THE

PREFACE.

THE Work, which I now offer to the Public, I undertook ſome years ſince at *Rome*, and brought it down to the Pontificate of *Victor*, that is, to the cloſe of the Second Century. As I was then a moſt zealous champion for the Pope's Supremacy, which was held as an article of Faith by the body I belonged to, my chief deſign, when I engaged in ſuch a work, was, to aſcertain that Supremacy, by ſhewing, century by century, that, from the Apoſtles times to the preſent, it had ever been acknowledged by the Catholic Church. But alas! I ſoon perceived that I had undertaken more than it was in my power to perform. Nay, while, in order to ſupport and maintain this cauſe, I examined, with particular attention, the writings of the Apoſtles, and of the many pious and learned men who had flouriſhed in the three firſt centuries of the church, I was ſo far from finding any thing that ſeemed the leaſt to countenance ſuch a doctrine, that, on the contrary, it appeared evident, beyond all diſpute, that, during the above-mentioned period of time, it had been utterly unknown to the Chriſtian world. In ſpite then of my endeavours to the contrary, Reaſon getting the better of the ſtrongeſt prejudices, I began to look upon the Pope's Supremacy, not only as a prerogative quite chimerical, but as the moſt impudent attempt that had ever been made: I ſay, in ſpite of

my endeavours to the contrary; for I was very unwilling to give up a point, upon which I had been taught by *Bellarmine*, that *the whole of Chriſtianity depended (a)*; eſpecially in a country, where a man cannot help being afraid even of his own thoughts, ſince upon the leaſt ſuſpicion of his only calling in queſtion any of the received opinions, he may depend upon his being ſoon convinced by more cogent arguments, than any in *Mood* and *Figure*. But great is the power of truth; and at laſt it prevailed: I became a proſelyte to the opinion which I had propoſed to confute; and ſincerely abjured in my mind, that which I had ignorantly undertaken to defend.

Being thus fully convinced, that the Pope's ſo much boaſted Supremacy was a bold and ungodly uſurpation, I could not help cenſuring with myſelf the men of learning, who had countenanced ſuch a pretenſion, eſpecially the two great champions of the Papal power, *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*. Did they not ſee what every man, who but dips into the primitive writers, muſt ſee, what is obvious to common ſenſe? The poor ſhifts they are often put to, their ridiculous evaſions and cavils, their unmeaning diſtinctions, their wreſting ſeveral paſſages, contrary to the plain and natural meaning of the authors they quote, and, above all, their unſatisfactory anſwers to the objections of the adverſe party, ſhew but too plainly, that they wrote not from conviction, nor aimed at truth, but, perhaps, at the *red Hat*, which was afterwards beſtowed on them, as a reward for betraying the truth. Few have wrote in defence of the Pope's Supremacy, that have not been preferred; and none perhaps who had not preferment in view. *Æneas Sylvius*, afterwards *Pius* II. being aſked, before he was raiſed to the Papal chair, How it happened, that in all diſputes between the Popes and the councils, many Divines ſided with the former, and very few with the latter? *Becauſe the Popes*, anſwered he, *have benefices*

(a) Bellar. Præf. de Sum. Pont.

fices to give, and the councils have none. Had he been aſked the ſame queſtion after he was Pope, he would not perhaps have returned the ſame anſwer; but ſaid, upon his being put in mind of it, as *Gregory* XIII. did afterwards on a like occaſion, that, *being raiſed higher, he ſaw better and farther.* Thoſe therefore, who have ſtood up in defence of the liberty of the church againſt Papal Uſurpation, cannot be ſuppoſed to have had any other inducement to eſpouſe the cauſe of truth, but truth itſelf. And this ſome have had the Chriſtian courage to do even in *Italy*, and almoſt in the Pope's hearing, at the peril of their liberty, of their lives, of all that was dear to them; as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew hereafter. But to return, in the mean time, to the preſent Hiſtory: I no ſooner found myſelf in a country where truth might be uttered without danger, than I reſolved to reſume and purſue in my native tongue, as ſoon as I recovered the uſe of it, the work I had begun in a foreign language. On the one ſide I ſaw the only obſtruction to an undertaking, which had already coſt me no ſmall pains and labour, happily removed; while I flattered myſelf on the other, that as a complete *Hiſtory of the Popes* was ſtill wanting, ſuch a performance might ſtill meet with a favourable reception from the public. I am well appriſed, that others have at different times, and in different languages, treated the ſame ſubject: but whether any of their ſeveral works may deſerve the name of a *complete*, or even of a *tolerable Hiſtory*, I leave thoſe to judge who have peruſed them; and ſhall only ſay in reſpect to myſelf, that, inſtead of diverting me from undertaking the ſame province, they have more than any thing elſe encouraged me to it. *Anaſtaſius* and *Platina*, the two *Claſſics*, as they are deemed in this branch of Hiſtory, have indeed given us the *Lives of the Popes*, from the foundation of the See of *Rome* to their times, but in ſo broken, imperfect, and unſatisfactory a manner, that from them we learn but

very little, even concerning thoſe of whom they have ſaid moſt. It was not their deſign to write a Hiſtory, but only to draw, as it were in miniature, the portraits of the *Roman* Biſhops, by relating, in a ſummary way, ſuch of their actions, as appeared to them moſt worthy of being recorded; and, to ſay the truth, they have both betrayed no leſs want of diſcernment in chuſing what they ſhould relate, than of exactneſs in relating what they had choſen.

Anaſtaſius the monk, ſirnamed *Bibliothecarius*, that is, Library-Keeper, Secretary, and Chancellor of the Church of *Rome*, (for all theſe employments anciently centered in one perſon, and were compriſed under the common name of *Bibliothecarius*,) flouriſhed in the ninth century, under *Nicolas* I. *Adrian* II. and *John* VIII. He wrote a ſuccinct account of the Biſhops, who governed the Church of *Rome*, from St. *Peter* to *Nicolas* I, who died in 867. But the memoirs he made uſe of were none of the beſt. In his time the world was over-run with forged or corrupted Pontificals, Martyrologies, Legends, *&c.* which were then no leſs univerſally received, than they have been ſince rejected by the learned of all perſuaſions. However, that from theſe the *Bibliothecarian* borrowed the greater part of his materials, at leaſt for the ſix firſt centuries, is but too apparent from his overlooking, nay, and often contradicting, the unexceptionable teſtimonies of cotemporary writers; as will be ſeen in the ſequel of the preſent Hiſtory. As therefore the records, which he copied, are ſo juſtly ſuſpected, and his own authority can be of no weight with reſpect to thoſe diſtant times, the reader muſt not be ſurpriſed to find, that, in this Hiſtory, I have paid no manner of regard to an author, who hath been hitherto blindly followed by thoſe, who have wrote on the ſame ſubject. There may indeed be ſome truth in what he relates; but his frequent miſtakes render that truth too precarious to be relied on, unleſs confirmed by the concurring teſtimonies

of

of other more credible and leſs credulous authors. However, in the times leſs remote from his own, I ſhall readily allow his authority its due weight; the rather as he ſeems not to have wrote with a deſign of impoſing upon others, but to have been impoſed upon himſelf by frauds and forgeries; for he wrote in an age, when the world lay involved in the thickeſt miſt of ignorance, when ſuperſtition and credulity triumphed without controul, and ſpurious pieces, filled with idle and improbable ſtories, had thruſt every grave writer, nay, and the Goſpels themſelves, out of doors.

Platina, ſo called from the *Latin* name of *Piadena*, a village in the *Cremoneſe*, the place of his nativity (for his true name was *Battiſta*, or *Bartolomeo Sacchi*), flouriſhed ſix hundred years after *Anaſtaſius*, that is, in the fifteenth century, under *Calixtus* III, *Pius* II. *Paul* II, and *Sixtus* IV. Under *Pius* II, he was ſecretary of the *Datary*, the office where vacant benefices are diſpoſed of; but being diſmiſſed by *Paul* II, although he had purchaſed the place, in the height of his reſentment, he appealed to the *future council*. What he ſuffered under that Pope, firſt in priſon, and afterwards on the rack, we ſhall hear from himſelf, in a more proper place. *Sixtus* IV, the ſucceſſor of *Paul*, well appriſed of his innocence, took him into favour, and, having enlarged, endowed, and enriched the *Vatican* library with a great number of valuable books, in different languages, he committed the care of them to him. It was probably at this time that he wrote or rather tranſcribed, the Lives of the Popes from St. *Peter*, whom he ſuppoſes the founder of that See, to *Paul* II, who died in 1471. I ſay *tranſcribed*; for if we except the few Popes who lived in or near his own times, *viz.* *Eugene* IV, *Nicolas* V, *Calixtus* III, *Pius* II, and *Paul* II, he copied, almoſt verbatim, all he hath ſaid of the reſt, only interweaving now and then the profane hiſtory

with the eccleſiaſtic (*b*). The Lives of the fourteen ſucceeding Popes, from *Paul* II, to *Pius* V, elected in 1566, were compiled by *Onuphrius Panvinius*, of the *Auguſtin* order, a man more commendable for his learning, than for his candor and veracity. Theſe are, as we may ſtile them, the original compilers of the Lives of the Popes: *Platina* adopted *Anaſtaſius*'s conciſe method of writing, and *Panvinius*, *Platina*'s, contenting themſelves with bare hints; and thereby putting their readers to the trouble of conſulting other writers, in order to gratify the curioſity they had raiſed. *Much hath been ſaid of the Popes by other Hiſtorians, but very little by their own*, as the learned *Pagi* obſerved, after comparing the authors I have mentioned, with the cotemporary Hiſtorians of other nations. I might well add, that the *very little* they have ſaid has been thought too much; whence ſome of them, and *Platina* in particular, have been made, in all their Editions ſince the middle of the ſixteenth century, to ſpeak with more reſerve, and to ſuppreſs or diſguiſe ſome truths they had formerly told.

As for thoſe who in later times have engaged in the ſame province, we need only dip into their works to be ſatisfied, that to ſearch out truth was not their buſineſs. Some are all praiſe and panegyric, others all ſatyr and gall: ſome have made it their ſtudy to excuſe the worſt of Popes, others to arraign the beſt. That many of the Popes, have been wicked men, abandonedly wicked, is undeniable, notwithſtanding the

(*b*) The authors he thus copied were *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, from S. *Peter*, or rather *Limus*, to *Nicolas* I; *Gulielmus*, likewiſe *Bibliothecarius*, from *Nicolas* I. to *Alexander* II; *Pandulphus Piſanus*, from *Alexander* II, to *Honorius* II; *Martinus Polonus*, from *Honorius* II, to *Honorius* IV; *Theodorus* of *Niem*, from *Honorius* IV, to *Urban* VI, and from *Urban* VI, to *Martin* V, who died in 1431; other writers, whoſe works are extant, but their names unknown. He likewiſe borrowed a great deal of *Ptolemæus Lucenſis*, a *Dominican* friar, who flouriſhed, and compiled the Lives of the Popes, in the time of *Boniface* VIII, choſen in the year 1294.

the pains have been taken to extenuate their crimes; but neither are there wanting ſome good men among them, of innocent lives and unblemiſhed characters, whoſe only crime is their having been Popes; and to miſrepreſent or miſconſtrue the virtuous actions of theſe, as ſome have done, is no leſs blameable in an Hiſtorian, than to diſſemble or gloſs over the criminal actions of the others. This partiality may be eaſily accounted for with reſpect to one great period of the preſent Hiſtory. During the quarrels and wars between the Popes and Emperors, which laſted many years, and occaſioned, in ſeventy-eight battles, the deſtruction of an infinite number of innocent people, two powerful factions reigned, as is well known, both in *Germany* and *Italy*, diſtinguiſhed by the names of *Guelphs* and *Ghibbelines*; the former being zealouſly attached to the Papal, and the latter to the Imperial intereſt. In the midſt of theſe diſtinctions few writers ſtood neuter, but ſiding, according to their different intereſts or inclinations, with one party or the other, drew their pens, each againſt the head of the party he oppoſed, with more rage than the ſoldiers did their ſwords. And hence it is, that we find the ſame facts related by cotemporary authors with ſuch different circumſtances; the ſame perſons, the Emperors eſpecially and the Popes, painted in ſuch different colours. Of this very few Writers in the latter times have been aware; and therefore have, as their bias led them to favour one cauſe more than the other, adopted as undoubted truths the many groundleſs aſperſions and undeſerved reproaches, which party zeal had ſuggeſted to the *Ghibbelines* againſt the Popes, or to the *Guelphs* againſt the Emperors. I wiſh I could intirely clear an eminent *Italian* hiſtorian of our own times from this imputation.

But, after all, as it was not merely with a view to ſupply the want of a complete hiſtory of the Popes, that I formerly undertook ſo laborious a taſk; neither

neither is it now with that view alone I reſume it. What I propoſed to myſelf, when I firſt undertook it, I have ſaid already; but being convinced that I laboured in vain, and convinced by ſuch evidence as the ſtrongeſt prejudice could not withſtand, I thought it a duty owing to truth, to ſet it forth to others in the ſame irreſiſtable light; and to defend at leaſt with as much zeal, the beſt of cauſes, as I had done the worſt. A diſloyal ſubject, who had taken up arms againſt his lawful Sovereign, would not be thought intirely to comply with his duty, by only laying them down: he ought if actuated by a true ſpirit of loyalty, and truly convinced of the badneſs of his cauſe, to range himſelf under the banners of his injured Lord, and devote to his ſervice and defence the ſword he had drawn againſt him. By a like obligation, a writer, who hath, even ignorantly, combated truth, is bound, not only to lay down his pen, as ſoon as he found himſelf engaged in a bad cauſe, but, when occaſion offereth, to turn againſt error in favour of truth the very weapon he had employed againſt truth in favour of error.

But to give the reader ſome account of the Hiſtory itſelf, and the method I have purſued in delivering it: I have intituled it, *The Hiſtory of the Popes*; but might as well have ſtyled it, *The Hiſtory of Popery*; ſince it not only containeth an account of the Lives and Actions of the Popes, but of every *Popiſh* tenet; when, by whom, on what occaſion, and to ſerve what purpoſe, each of them was broached; thoſe more eſpecially which relate to the Pope as *Chriſt's Vicar upon earth*, as *the Supreme Head of the Church*, as *an Infallible Guide to ſalvation*; for theſe are the prerogatives he claimeth, as entailed upon, and inſeparable from the *Roman* See. But that no ſuch doctrines were known in the firſt and pureſt ages of Chriſtianity; that the Biſhop of *Rome* was then, nay and thought himſelf, upon the level with other Biſhops; that the Catholic Church acknowledged

no

no power, authority, or juriſdiction in the Biſhop of *Rome*, but what was common to him with all other Biſhops, will appear ſo plain from the following Hiſtory, that I can hardly conceive it poſſible for any man, however prejudiced in favour of the *Papal Power* and *Popiſh Religion*, to peruſe it without abjuring the one and the other: I am but too well appriſed of the ſtrength of prejudice; but, ſtrong as it is, it can never be proof againſt plain matter of fact. For who can believe, for inſtance, in the Pope's infallibility, who can help looking upon ſuch an article of belief as the groſſeſt affront that ever was offered to human underſtanding, when he reads of *a Liberius* admitting and ſigning the *Arian* creed, or confeſſion of faith, declared heretical by all his Succeſſors; of an *Honorius* condemned by the Fathers of the ſixth Oecumenical Council, as *an organ of the devil*, for holding the hereſy of the *Monothelites*; of *John* XXII. preaching up and propagating, both by his Miſſionaries and his Legates *a latere*, a doctrine, which he himſelf retracted on his death-bed; of ſeven Popes (*c*) curſing and damning, in emluation of one another, all who denied a certain tenet (*d*), and another Pope (*e*) as heartily curſing and damning all who maintained it, nay and recurring to the *Ultima Ratio* of the later Popes, the *Fagot*, in order to *root out of the Church* (theſe are his very words) *ſo peſtilential, erroneous, heretical, and blaſphemous* a doctrine? This occaſioned great ſcandal in the Church, inſomuch that ſome even took the liberty to

(*c*) *Gregory* IX, *Innocent* IV, *Alexander* IV, *Nicolas* III, *Martin* IV, *Nicolas* IV, *Clement* V.

(*d*) That the *Franciſcan* Friars had no property, in common or in private; a queſtion, if any ever was, *de lana caprina*. What was it to mankind? what to the Chriſtian religion, whether a few Friars had, or had not, any property? No man was the better for believing they had, no man the worſe for believing they had not. And yet to read the bulls of the Popes one would think, that the whole of Chriſtianity had been at ſtake.

(*e*) *John* XXII.

to repreſent to his Holineſs, that the Decrees and Conſtitutions of one Pope could not be reverſed by another. The Pope replied, (and what other reply could he make?) *That they were miſtaken, ſince it might be proved by innumerable inſtances, that what had been decreed wrong or amiſs by one Pope or Council, could be rectified and amended by another.* This anſwer ſilenced them at once, ſays our Hiſtorian: And well it might; I am only ſurpriſed, that the word *Infallibility* hath ever been ſince heard of. The *Franciſcan* Friars, who had occaſioned the diſpute, paid dear for it: As they continued to plead the Infallibility of ſeven Popes againſt that of one, and obſtinately adhered to their doctrine, Pope *John*, loſing all patience, ordered all to be burnt alive, who did not receive his conſtitution; which was done accordingly, and many of thoſe unhappy wretches choſe rather to expire in the flames than to yield. Theſe remarkable tranſactions are related by ſeveral cotemporary writers of unqueſtionable authority, and among the reſt by *Nicolaus Eymericus*, who was Inquiſitor of the province of *Tarragon*, and hath inſerted them in his *Directorium Inquiſitorium* (*f*). Other facts without number, of the ſame nature, and alike irreconcileable with the other prerogatives claimed by the Popes, as well as with the chief articles of the *Roman Catholic* religion, will occur in this Hiſtory, and all ſo well atteſted, that nothing, I think, can withſtand the force of Truth thus diſplayed. Logical arguments and controverſial reaſoning cannot be well adapted to every underſtanding, and therefore are not always attended with the deſired effect, however ſkilfully managed; but hiſtorical facts lie level to the meaneſt capacities, and the conſequences thence deducible

(*f*) Direct. Inquiſ. part. ii. quæſt. 51. See alſo *Antoninus* in his *Summa theologiæ*, part. iv. tit. ii. c. 7. num. 5; *Petrus Alliacus Cameracenſis*; *Continuator Nangii ad ann.* 1333; *Joannes Gerſo in Ser de Feſt. Paſchat. Longus in Monaſ. Ciceſter. Chronic.* and *Gobelinus Coſmodromii ætat.* vi. c. 71.

ducible are to the meaneſt capacities plain and obvious. It is true, the Sticklers for the See of *Rome* have endeavoured to darken the cleareſt facts, ſince they could not deny them, as being vouched by their own approved authors; but they have done it in ſo aukward a manner, with ſuch abſurd, ridiculous, and unintelligible interpretations, comments, diſtinctions, *&c.* that, were it not well known it was their intereſt to defend that cauſe, one would be apt to think they intended rather to ridicule than defend it.

But if the Popes were originally mere Biſhops, upon the level with other Biſhops; if they had no power but what was common to them with all other Biſhops; by what means could they thus exalt themſelves above their Collegues, nay *above all that is called God?* What could induce their Collegues, and with them the greater part of the *Chriſtian* world, to acknowledge ſuch an unheard-of power, and ſubmit to a yoke of all others the moſt heavy and tyrannical? For an anſwer to theſe queſtions I refer the reader to the following Hiſtory, where he will find every branch of power, authority, or juriſdiction, claimed by the Popes, traced from its firſt origin, and the various ſteps pointed out, by which they raiſed themſelves from the loweſt beginnings to the higheſt pitch of greatneſs; which is opening a ſchool of the moſt refined policy, that ever was known or practiſed upon earth. In this reſpect we muſt own the Popes to have been, generally ſpeaking, men of extraordinary talents, the ableſt Politicians we read of in Hiſtory, Stateſmen fit to govern the world, and equal to the vaſt dominion they graſped at; a Dominion over the Minds as well as the Bodies and Eſtates of mankind; a Dominion, of all that ever were formed, the moſt wide and extenſive, as knowing no other bounds but thoſe of the earth; nay, and not even thoſe, ſince theſe mighty Princes claim to themſelves all power in heaven as well as in earth,

all

all power over the dead as well as the living. To eſtabliſh the ſpiritual part of this wondrous Authority upon the Goſpel of *Chriſt*, which contradicts it in every line, was an undertaking of no little difficulty, and that required no common ſkill: to eſtabliſh the temporal dominion without a fleet, without an army; to ſubject to it not only the ignorant and ſuperſtitious multitude, but Kings themſelves, nay and to prevail, upon them to employ both their arms and their intereſt in promoting a power evidently derogatory to and inconſiſtent with their own; was a work not to be accompliſhed but by men of ſuperior talents, thoroughly acquainted with all the arts of inſinuation and addreſs, and ſteady in purſuing, by the beſt concerted meaſures, the great point that they conſtantly had in their view.

Two things, however, concurred to facilitate, in ſome degree, the eſtabliſhing of the one and the other; *viz.* the profound ignorance of the times, and the matchleſs cunning of the perſons employed by the Popes as their Emiſſaries and Agents; without which helps no impoſture was ever carried on with ſucceſs.

It was *in the night, while men ſlept*, while the earth was overſpread with the darkeſt night of ignorance, that *the enemy came, and ſowed his tares*. From the beginning of the Seventh Century to the time of the reformation, Letters were utterly neglected; and in proportion to that neglect Credulity and Superſtition, the inſeparable companions of Ignorance, prevailed among the Laity even of the higheſt ranks: the little knowledge that ſtill remained (and very little did remain) was wholly confined to the Clergy, chiefly to the Monks, men moſt zealouſly attached to the intereſt of the Pope, as well knowing, that by promoting his intereſt, they promoted at the ſame time their own. It was in this period of time, in this long darkneſs of ignorance, credulity, and ſuperſtition, that the Pope and his Agents introduced maxims

maxims and notions concerning the Papal Prerogatives, very different from thoſe which the world had entertained to that time. In the beginning of the Seventh Century, that is, in the year 666, Pope *Boniface* III, a man of great addreſs, having craftily inſinuated himſelf into the favour of *Phocas*, obtained of that Traitor and Murderer (*g*) the famous Reſcript ſettling the Supremacy on the See of *Rome*, in oppoſition to the claim of the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. As *Phocas* bore an irreconcileable hatred to *Cyriacus*, who was then veſted with the Patriarchal dignity, he was the more eaſily prevailed upon to decide the Controverſy, which had already laſted a long time between the two Sees, in favour of the See of *Rome*. If this hatred in the Uſurper was owing to the zeal of *Cyriacus* in laying before him the enormity of his crime, and exhorting him to repentance, *Boniface*, nay and his predeceſſor St. *Gregory the Great* (*h*), knew better how to make their court to men in power, than to take the leaſt notice of their ſins, however publick, or mention *Repentance* in their hearing. Be that as it will, it is certain, that to this monſter of wickedneſs the Church of *Rome* owes her Supremacy. And it was this Grant from *Phocas*, that more than any thing elſe inſpired the Biſhops of *Rome* with pride and preſumption; which encreaſing as their power encreaſed, they were carried by degrees to all the exceſſes an unbounded ambition can ſuggeſt, when free from all curb of Conſcience, Morality, and Religion.

Yet,

(*g*) *Phocas* ſettled himſelf on the imperial throne by the murder of *Mauritius*, his lawful ſovereign, and the maſſacre of his ſix children, and of all his friends and relations. Five of his children he cauſed to be inhumanly butchered in the preſence of their Father.

(*h*) *Gregory* ſtyles him a moſt pious and religious Prince; cauſed his image, and that of his wife *Leontia*, who was no better than he, to be lodged in an oratory at *Rome*, and congratulating him on his advancement to the throne, aſcribes it to a particular Providence.

Yet, after all, the Supremacy granted by *Phocas* was but a Supremacy of Order and Dignity; it gave no *new* power to the Biſhop of *Rome*, but only raiſed him above his Collegues, eſpecially his Rival, the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and made him, as ſome expreſs it, *the Firſt among his Equals*. But his Succeſſors, thirſting after power, and ſcorning to hold their dignity by ſo precarious a tenure as the Emperor's pleaſure, which might hereafter revoke the deciſion of *Phocas*, and give the Precedence in rank to *Conſtantinople* inſtead of *Rome*, began to diſown the favour they had received, to ſet up for themſelves and to claim the Supremacy, as inherent by Divine Right in their See, and derived from St. *Peter*, as Chief of the Apoſtles and Head of the Church. Thus was the foundation of the Supremacy changed; and wiſely changed, according to the rules of human policy. The old foundation was no ways proportioned to the immenſe ſuperſtructure, which they now began to deſign; ſince they could claim but very little power, if any at all, in virtue of the Emperor's Grant. But the new foundation was capable of bearing whatever the moſt unbounded and aſpiring ambition could build on it. Beſides, the Biſhop of *Rome* could not challenge, by a Reſcript of the *Roman* Emperor, any Superiority over the Churches, that had no dependence on the *Roman* Empire. But a Supremacy, inherent by Divine Right in the Papal Dignity, raiſed him at once above all the Biſhops of the Catholic Church. What therefore now remained was, to improve this extenſive Supremacy into a no leſs extenſive Power and Juriſdiction. And here no time was loſt, many circmſtances concurring to promote and forward the execution of their attempt. Beſides the ignorance of the times, and the influence of the Monks, which operated ſtrongly in their behalf, the Princes of *Europe* were quarrelling among themſelves

themſelves about the Weſtern parts of the *Roman* empire, and all glad to purchaſe at any rate, the friendſhip of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who, after the famous Donation of *Pepin* in 754, had taken great ſtate upon him, and bore a conſiderable ſway in all public affairs: As for the Biſhops, and the reſt of the Secular Clergy, they looked upon the Pope, eſpecially after he had added the Sword to the Keys, as their protector and defender; and were on that conſideration diſpoſed to concur in ſtrengthening his power, and rendering it formidable, though at the expence of their own; chuſing rather to ſubject themſelves to an Eccleſiaſtical maſter, than to ſubmit to the Civil authority. I might add, that ſome now began to mind the Fleece more than the Flock: and with That it was ſome time before the Popes thought it proper to meddle; but, when they did, they ſoon retrieved, by the haſte that they made, the time they had loſt.

Yet I do not believe that they deſigned at firſt to run thoſe lengths, or carry the Papal Prerogative to that extravagant height they afterwards did. The ſucceſs, that attended them in the purſuit of one claim, encouraged them to ſet up and purſue another. Of this no one can doubt, who peruſeth with the leaſt attention the Records of thoſe ages, and compares the Popes in the beginning of the Seventh Century with the Popes in the latter end of the Eleventh. We ſhall find them, in the firſt-mentioned period of time, ſubmitting with all humility to Princes; claiming no kind of authority or juriſdiction whatſoever but in the virtue of the Canons of Councils, or the Reſcripts of Emperors; glorying or pretending to glory, in the humble title of *Servants of ſervants*; acknowledging themſelves Subjects and Vaſſals of the Emperors, and patiently waiting the will and pleaſure of their liege lords to take upon them the Epiſcopal dignity, or exerciſe the functions of that office. Such were the Biſhops of *Rome* in the

beginning of the Seventh Century. How different from thoſe in the latter end of the Eleventh! They were then veſted with the *Plenitude of all power*, both Spiritual and Temporal; above Councils, and uncontrouled by their Canons; the fountain of all Paſtoral juriſdiction and authority; and, by Divine ſanction, impowered to enact, eſtabliſh, abrogate, ſuſpend, all Eccleſiaſtical Laws and Conſtitutions: they were then become *Lords* and *Maſters*, the moſt haughty and imperious Lords, the moſt ſevere Maſters mankind had ever groaned under: they no more begged but diſpenſed titles, boaſting a power of ſetting up Kings, and pulling them down at pleaſure; of calling them to an account, abſolving their ſubjects from their allegiance, diveſting them of their dominions, and treating in every reſpect as their ſlaves and vaſſals thoſe, whom one of their beſt and greateſt Predeceſſors (*i*) had acknowledged *ſuperior to all Men*, and thought himſelf *in duty bound to obey*. This *Plenitude of power*, as they ſtyle it, was not acquired at once, but by degrees, as I have obſerved above; ſome of the Popes being more and ſome leſs active, crafty, and aſpiring. But what is very remarkable, of the one hundred and fourteen between *Boniface* III. who laid the foundation of the Papal grandeur, and *Gregory* VII. who raiſed it to the higheſt pitch, not one ever loſt an inch of ground his Predeceſſors had gained. And thus, by conſtantly acquiring, and never parting with what they had acquired, nay, and tying the hands of their ſucceſſors by the irreverſible entail of a Divine Right, they became the ſole Spiritual Lords, and had almoſt made themſelves the greateſt Temporal Lords of the whole Chriſtian world.

But by what particular means they roſe to ſuch a height of grandeur and majeſty, by what artifices and ſubtile contrivances they maintained what they had uſurped, and ſtrove to retrieve what they had loſt, when it pleaſed Divine Providence to check, and reſtrain

(*i*) *Gregory the Great.*

reſtrain within more narrow bounds their overgrown power, the reader will learn from the following Hiſtory. Some of the arts they have made uſe of are of the moſt refined, and ſome of the blackeſt nature; and both I have endeavoured, in this work, to ſet forth in their trueſt light, without diſguiſe or exaggeration; thoſe more eſpecially which the Popes and their Agents have formerly employed, and ſtill employ, to bring anew under their yoke ſuch nations as have had the Chriſtian courage to ſhake it off, and aſſert that *Liberty, wherewith Chriſt hath made us free.* If I ſhall be ſo happy as thereby to keep awake and alive, in the breaſt of every true *Engliſhman*, that noble ardour, which hath on a late occaſion, exerted itſelf in ſo diſtinguiſhed a manner: if it ſhall pleaſe Heaven to ſecond my Undertaking ſo far, as to alarm by it thoſe Proteſtants, (I wiſh I might not ſay thoſe *many* Proteſtants) who are not aware of, nor ſufficiently guarded againſt, the crafty inſinuations, the ſecret view and attempts of the Papal Emiſſaries, I ſhall think the time and pains it hath coſt me abundantly paid.

I am well appriſed of the reception a work of this nature muſt meet with, and of the treatment its author muſt expect, both at home and abroad, from the Popiſh Zealots. But let them vent their zeal in what manner they pleaſe, I ſhall neither anſwer nor reſent their reproaches and cenſures, however malignant and groundleſs: nay, I ſhall hear them with as much pleaſure and ſatisfaction as I ſhould the praiſes and commendations of others; it being no leſs meritorious in a writer to have diſpleaſed the enemies of Truth than to have pleaſed the friends. And Theſe, I flatter myſelf, will find no great room for cenſure: it would grieve me if they ſhould, ſince I have done all that lay in my power to leave none. I have advanced nothing, for which I have not ſufficient vouchers: and theſe I have taken care to quote in the margin, that the reader, by recurring

to the places pointed out in each author, may be convinced of my ſincerity and candor. I have always preferred the cotemporary writers, when equally credible, to thoſe who wrote after, though not without taking notice of their diſagreement; and ſuch as flouriſhed neareſt the times when the tranſactions happened, which they relate, to thoſe who lived at a greater diſtance. Purſuant to this rule, in delivering the Lives of the Biſhops who governed the Church of *Rome* during the Firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, I have confined myſelf wholly to the Primitive writers, truſting no Modern any farther, than as he wrote from the Ancients. From theſe there is no Appeal; it is by them, and them alone, that the Papal Supremacy muſt ſtand or fall. If they have all conſpired to miſrepreſent the ſenſe of the ages in which they lived (and it is only by this hypotheſis that the Supremacy can be ſupported), in what other monuments ſhall we ſearch for it?

The Partiality, which I have ſo much complained of above in the works of others, I have taken all poſſible care to avoid in my own; checking the very firſt emotions of that zeal, which, on my reflecting how long, and how groſly I had been impoſed upon, would, if not carefully watched, have proved as ſtrong a bias in me againſt the *Pope* and the *Popiſh Religion*, as the oppoſite zeal hath proved for them in others. The vices and vicious actions of the bad Popes I have not diſſembled; but neither have I magnified them: the virtues and commendable actions of the good Popes I have neither leſſened nor miſconſtrued: nay, I have more than once juſtified the conduct and character of ſome pious men among them, greatly injured by their own Hiſtorians, becauſe, they lived, and ſuffered mankind to live, in peace; applying themſelves ſolely, as it became good Biſhops, to the diſcharge of their Paſtoral Duty. Theſe their Hiſtorians have ſtrongly miſrepreſented, meaſuring the merit of each Pope by the great things they

they atchieved, no matter by what means, for the exaltation of their See; which, in other terms, is meaſuring their Merit by their Pride and Ambition.

The Length of this Hiſtory requireth, I preſume, no Apolgy. Every one knows, that the Popes acted, for ſeveral ages, as the Umpires of *Europe*, or rather as the Sovereigns; ſeveral Princes being actually their vaſſals, and the reſt affecting to pay them the ſame reſpect as if they were. This emboldened them to intermeddle in the public affairs of each State and Kingdom; inſomuch, that no remarkable event happened, no revolution, no change of government or conſtitution, which they did not either promote or oppoſe, as it ſuited their Intereſt, with too many of them the only ſtandard of right and wrong; and their authority, through the ignorance, credulity, and ſuperſtition of thoſe unhappy times, was generally ſpeaking, of ſuch weight, as to turn the ſcale into which it was thrown. Beſides, they had, in every Kingdom and Nation, their Legates or Vicars, who, together with the Clergy, formed, as it were, a ſeparate State, and one Kingdom or Empire within another. Theſe, at the inſtigation of the Popes, their Lords and Maſters, were conſtantly encroaching on the Civil Authority and Juriſdiction, on the Rights of the People, and Prerogatives of Princes. Hence aroſe innumerable diſputes, which, if Princes did not comply with their demands, ended in anathemas, interdicts, civil wars, rebellions, private aſſaſſinations, and public maſſacres. Thoſe who are verſed in the Hiſtories of other nations, as well as in that of our own, and know what a conſiderable part the detail of theſe fatal diſputes taketh up in the particular Hiſtories of each State and Kingdom, will not find fault with the Length of this, which, if complete, and as ſuch I offer it to the public, muſt compriſe them all. Beſides, I have given a ſummary account of the many Hereſies that have ſprung up in the Church;

of the Councils that have been held; of the religious and military Orders; of their Founders, inſtitutions, fundamental laws, &c; ſubjects all, in ſome degree, connected with the Hiſtory of the Popes.

I do not doubt, but this Work will meet with a favourable Reception from *Proteſtants* of all denominations; ſuch a Reception, I mean, as is due to Truth. It will, I flatter myſelf, retard, at leaſt, the daily increaſe of the Papal intereſt in theſe happy Kingdoms. As for the *Roman Catholics* here, would they but lay aſide their prejudices, ſo far as to peruſe it with the leaſt degree of candor and attention, I am confident Truth would exert its power no leſs efficaciouſly upon ſome of them, than it hath done upon me. They cannot ſurely be more biaſſed in favour of the errors they have been brought up in, than I was. In them Truth hath but one enemy to contend with, Education; in me it had two, Education and Intereſt; and the latter is but too often the more powerful of the two. What I forfeited by adhering to Truth, moſt of the *Roman Catholics* in *England* well know; and I am very confident none of them can ſay, that I have ever yet reaped, or ſought to reap, the leaſt temporal benefit from it. If therefore the Power of Truth, when duly diſplayed, is ſo great, as to triumph thus over the combined force of Education and Intereſt, we may well hope, that it will, at leaſt in ſome, triumph over Education alone: I moſt heartily wiſh it may in all.

TO THE

KING.

Sir,

IT is not only as having the happineſs to be your ſubject that I beg your permiſſion to lay this Book at Your feet. In whatever part of the world I had been born, or had reſided, I ſhould have deſired to preſent it to Your Majeſty, as the Great Protector of the Reformed Religion, and worthily filling that Throne, which, above any in *Europe*, is the chief Bulwark againſt the Papal Power, and all its pernicious attendants. The wonderful riſe and monſtrous growth of that Power, almoſt to the ruin of all true Religion, and all the Civil rights of mankind, will be delineated in the courſe of this Work, which I flatter myſelf may be of ſome Uſe to the Proteſtant Cauſe. For next to the light of the Goſpel there is nothing that Popery hath more to fear, than that of hiſtorical Truth: It is a teſt which the pretenſions and doctrines of *Rome* can never abide; and therefore ſhe hath uſed her utmoſt endeavours, not only to lock up the Goſpel from the eyes of the Laity, and prefer her own Comments, Decrees, and Traditions, to the authority of the Scriptures, but to corrupt, diſguiſe, and falſify Hiſtory, in which neceſſary buſineſs her ableſt pens have been employed. To take off thoſe diſguiſes, and diſcover thoſe falſhoods, is conſequently a taſk becoming the zeal of a good Proteſtant; and my intention at leaſt, although not my performance, encourageth me to hope for your Majeſty's Gracious Protection.

In the latter part of this Hiſtory I ſhall have often the pleaſure to ſhew, how great an Inſtrument, under GOD, the Power and Strength of this kingdom hath

been to maintain and ſupport the Reformation all over *Europe*. But I muſt alſo ſhew with concern, that from the death of our wiſe Queen *Elizabeth*, the Princes of the Houſe of *Stuart*, inſtead of purſuing that glorious Plan, which ſhe had traced out, were either remiſs in the cauſe, or wholly forſook it; ſo that had not the Revolution providentially happened, and in conſequence of it the Houſe of *Brunſwick* been called to the Throne of theſe Kingdoms, the Reformed Religion would, in all probability, have not only been loſt in *Great Britain*, or at leaſt under a ſtate of ſevere perſecution, but would have been in great danger every were elſe, from ſuch a change in the Ballance of Power as that event muſt have produced. The ſupport of Your Royal Family is therefore moſt neceſſary, even upon motives of ſelf-preſervation, to every Proteſtant both here and abroad. May a due ſenſe of that important connection between Your ſafety and Theirs be always kept alive in their minds. May our Holy Religion continue to flouriſh under Your Majeſty's care, and that of Your Royal Poſterity, to the lateſt times. May neither the open attacks, nor ſecret machinations of *Rome* prevail againſt it. And may it produce all the Fruits that ought to ſpring from it, the truly-chriſtian ſpirit of Toleration, univerſal charity, good morals, good learning, freedom of thought, and candour of mind. I need add no other wiſhes or prayers to theſe: They comprehend all happineſs to Your Majeſty, to Your Royal Family, and to my Country; and they come from the heart of,

Sir,

Your Majeſty's
Moſt Loyal,
Moſt Faithful,
And moſt devoted Subject,

ARCHIBALD BOWER.



THE HISTORY OF THE POPES, OR BISHOPS of *ROME.*

St. *PETER.*

IT is out of ſome Regard to an antient Tradition, that I have placed St. *Peter* at the Head of the Biſhops of *Rome*, though I am well appriſed, that this, like moſt other Traditions, will hardly ſtand the Teſt of a ſtrict and impartial Examination. To avoid being impoſed upon, we ought to treat Tradition as we do a notorious and known Lyer, to whom we give no Credit, unleſs what he ſays is confirmed to us by ſome Perſon of undoubted Veracity. If it is affirmed by him alone, we can at moſt but ſuſpend our Belief, not rejecting it as falſe, becauſe a Lyer may ſometimes

speak Truth; but we cannot, upon his bare Authority, admit it as true. Now that St. *Peter* was at *Rome*, that he was Bishop of *Rome*, we are told by Tradition alone, which, at the same time, tells us of so many strange Circumstances attending his coming to that Metropolis, his staying in it, his withdrawing from it, *&c.* that, in the Opinion of every unprejudiced Man, the Whole must savour strongly of Romance. Thus we are told, that St. *Peter* went to *Rome*, chiefly to oppose *Simon*, the celebrated Magician; that at their first Interview, at which *Nero* himself was present, he flew up into the Air, in the Sight of the Emperor, and the whole City; but that the Devil, who had thus raised him, struck with Dread and Terror at the Name of *Jesus*, whom the Apostle invoked, let him fall to the Ground, by which Fall he broke his Legs. Should you question the Truth of this Tradition at *Rome*, they would shew you the Prints of St. *Peter*'s Knees in the Stone, on which he kneeled on this Occasion, and anohter Stone still dyed with the Blood of the Magician (A).

Tradition not to be depended upon.

Fabulous Accounts of St. Peter.

The *Romans* as we are told, highly incensed against him for thus maiming and bringing to Disgrace, one to whom they paid divine Honours, vowed his Destruction; whereupon the Apostle thought it adviseable to retire for a while from the City, and had already reached the Gate, when, to his great Surprize, he met our Saviour coming in, as he went out, who, upon St. *Peter*'s asking him where he was going, returned this Answer, *I am going to* Rome *to be crucified anew*; which, as St. *Peter* understood it, was upbraiding him with his Flight; whereupon he turned back, and

(A) This Account seems to have been borrowed from *Suetonius*, who speaks of a Person, that, in the public Sports undertook to fly in the Presence of the Emperor *Nero*, but, on his first Attempt, fell to the Ground; by which Fall his Blood sprung out with such Violence, that it reached the Emperor's Canopy (1).

(1) Suet. l. 6. c. 12.

and was ſoon after ſeized by the provoked *Romans*, and, by an Order from the Emperor, crucified. Theſe, and a thouſand like Stories, however fabulous and romantic they may ſeem, we cannot, without great Incoherency, reject, if we admit St. *Peter* to have been at *Rome*, ſince the Whole is equally vouched by the ſame Authority, and hath been upon the ſame Authority equally believed by thoſe, who are called in by the Advocates for the See of *Rome*, to witneſs St. *Peter's* having preached the Goſpel in that City. Theſe are *Arnobius*[a], *Cyril of Jeruſalem*[b], *Euſebius*[c], *Irenæus*[d], *Tertullian*[e], *Jerom*[f], and *Juſtin* the Martyr[g]. Theſe have all ſuppoſed St. *Peter* to have been at *Rome*, and, togeher with St. *Paul*, to have planted Chriſtianity in that great Metropolis of the World: but this they took upon Tradition, and conſequently their Authority is of no greater Weight than Tradition itſelf, which had they duly examined, they would not perhaps have ſo readily pinned their Faith upon it. Falſe and lying Traditions are of an early Date, and the greateſt Men have, out of a pious Credulity, ſuffered themſelves to be impoſed upon by them. How many Traditions, after having reigned for Ages without Controul, were, upon the Reformation, when Men took the Liberty to examine what they believed, rejected by the Church, aſhamed to own them, and degraded into popular Errors! But that of St. *Peter's* having been at *Rome*, and the firſt Biſhop of that City, was a Tradition of too great Conſequence not to be maintained at all Events, ſince upon that chiefly was fouuded the Claim of his pretended Succeſſor to an uncontrouled Authority, and univerſal Juriſdiction; a Foundation infinitely too weak for ſuch an immenſe Superſtructure.

The greateſt Men impoſed upon by falſe Traditions.

And

[a] Arnob, l. 2. in Gent. [b] Cyril. catech. 6. [c] Euſeb. l. 2. c. 14. [d] Iren. l. 2. c. 20. [e] Tert. de anim. c. 24. [f] Hier. de vir. illuſtr. c. 2. [g] Juſtin. apol. 2.

How little regard paid to them by some Popes.

And here I cannot help obſerving the little Regard that the Popes themſelves have ſhewn to Tradition, though received by the greateſt Lights of the Church, when it did not promote the Honour or Intereſt of their See. Of this we have a glaring Inſtance in a parallel Caſe; for as St. *Peter*, according to Tradition, travelled to *Rome*, ſo did St. *Paul*, according to Tradition, travel into *Spain*: the former Tradition was received by the Writers I have quoted above, and the latter by ſome of the ſame Writers, *viz.* by *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*[h], and *Jerom*[i], and by *Athanaſius*[k], *Chryſoſtom*[l], *Theodoret*[m], *Gregory* the Great[n], and many others; yet ſuch a Tradition was rejected, perhaps juſtly, by Pope *Innocent* I. who would not allow St. *Paul* to have ever been in *Spain*[o]. Have we not an equal Right to queſtion, or even to deny, St. *Peter*'s having ever been at *Rome*? Are not the Authorities at leaſt equal on both Sides? Why then muſt the Travels of one Apoſtle be looked upon as an Article of Faith, and thoſe of the other be deemed fabulous?

No Mention in the Scripture of St. Peter's having ever been at Rome.

And truly, if we examine narrowly into this Matter, the former Tradition will appear no leſs groundleſs to us, than the latter did to that Pope: for, in the firſt Place, neither St. *Peter* himſelf, nor any of the ſacred Writers, give us the leaſt Hint or Intimation of his ever having been at *Rome*. We are told of his being at *Antioch*, at *Jeruſalem*, at *Corinth*, at *Babylon*[p]; but of the great Metropolis of the Empire, where he is ſuppoſed to have fixed his See, not the leaſt Mention is made. And may we not from that Silence queſtion, to ſay no more, his having ever been there? I know that by *Babylon*, from whence St. *Peter* wrote his firſt Epiſtle[q], *Euſebius*[r], *Jerom*[s], the

[h] Cyr. cat. 17. [i] Hier. in Iſai. xi. 14. [k] Athan. ad Drac. [l] Chryſ. ad Hebr. præf. [m] Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 17. [n] Greg. in Joh. xxiii. 22. [o] Council. tom. 2. p. 1245. [p] Act. xi. 2. xv. 7. Gal. i. 18. ii. 9. Gal. ii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 13. 1 Cor. i. 12: [q] 1 Pet. v. 13. [r] Euſeb. l. 2. c. 15. [s] Hier. vir. illuſt. c. 8.

the Venerable *Bede* [t], *Oecumenius* [u], and *Grotius* [w], underſtood *Rome*; but this is a bare Conjecture, and no better grounded than that of others, who thought that by *Babylon* was meant *Jeruſalem* [x]. The learned Doctor *Pearſon*, Biſhop of *Cheſter*, ſeeing no Occaſion here to recur to a figurative Senſe, is of Opinion, that the above-mentioned Epiſtle was written not from *Babylon* in *Chaldæa*, which then lay in Ruins, but from *Babylon* in *Egypt*; and no Man has taken more Pains to make the World believe, that St. *Peter* preached at *Rome*, and founded that See [y]. But, in this Controverſy, the Silence of St. *Paul* in particular, if duly attended to, muſt be thought, by every unbiaſſed Man, a far more convincing Proof of St. *Peter*'s not having been at *Rame*, than all the Authorities that have been yet alledged are of his having been there. For that Appoſtle, while at *Rome*, had frequent Opportunities of mentioning his Fellow-Apoſtle, and Fellow-Labourer; and yet, naming ſeveral others, he is quite ſilent as to him. From *Rome* he wrote to the *Galatians*, to the *Epheſians*, to the *Philippians*, to the *Coloſſians*, to *Timothy*, and to *Philemon*, without ever mentioning *Peter*, or ſending any Salutation from him; nay, it is certain, that St. *Peter* was not at *Rome* when the Apoſtle of the Gentiles wrote to the *Coloſſians*; for, mentioning *Tychicus*, *Oneſimus*, *Ariſtarchus*, *Marcus* and *Juſtus*, he adds, *Theſe alone, my Fellow-workers unto the Kingdom of God, who have been a Comfort unto me* [z]. *Peter* was not there, when St. *Paul* wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to *Timothy*, where he ſays, *At my firſt Anſwer no Man ſtood with me, but all Men forſook me* [a]: nor was he there immediately before St. *Paul*'s Death, when *the Time of his Departure was at hand*; for he tells *Timothy* that *all the Brethren did ſalute* him; and, naming *Eubulus*, *Pudens*,

St. Paul, in the many Letters he wrote from Rome, *never mentions St.* Peter.

[t] Bed. tom. 5. p. 713. [u] Oecu. p. 526. [w] Grot. ſynopſ. in Pet. [x] Vide Grot. ib. p. 541. [y] Pearſ. oper. poſth. p. 56 & ſeq. [z] Coloſſ. iv. 11. [a] Tim. iv. 6.

dens, *Linus*, and *Claudia* [b], he omits *Peter*, whom we may thence conclude not to have been there. And yet it is a received Tradition in the Church of *Rome*, that St. *Peter* was then not only in that Metropolis, but confined and bound in the ſame Priſon with St. *Paul*. As that Apoſtle, in writing from *Rome*, ſends no Salutations from *Peter*, ſo in writing to *Rome*, he greets many others, but never mentions him [c]. Now who would not ſooner chuſe to reject ſuch Traditions, than to ſuppoſe St. *Paul* guilty of ſuch an unfriendly and unaccountable Omiſſion?

St. Peter, *though at* Rome, *not Biſhop of* Rome.

From what hath been hitherto ſaid, every impartial Judge muſt conclude, that it is at leaſt very much to be doubted whether St. *Peter* was ever at *Rome*; but, allowing him to have been there, it ſtill remains to be proved, that he was Biſhop of that See. This the Sticklers for the Papal Authority ſpare no Pains to make out, being well appriſed, that the Whole of their Cauſe lies here at ſtake; and yet I find nothing alledged by them in ſo material a Point, but a few miſinterpreted Paſſages out of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers: for the right Underſtanding of which it is to be obſerved, that ſuch of the Antients as called *Peter* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Rome* the *Place*, the *Chair*, the *See* of *Peter*, meant no more than that he was Superintendant of that Church, that he founded it by converting Men to the Faith, and erected the Epiſcopal Chair, by appointing the firſt Biſhops. That this was the true Meaning, is apparent from what we read in *Ruffinus*; who, having mentioned *Linus*, *Cletus*, and *Clemens*, as ſucceeding each other in the See of *Rome*, while *Peter* was ſtill alive, thus accounts for their Epiſcopacy: They were, ſays he, appointed Biſhops by *Peter*, to the end, that, they taking upon them the epiſcopal Charge, he might be at Leiſure to diſcharge the Duties of his Apoſtolical Office. And this, he tells us, was not a Notion of his own, but

[b] 2 Tim. iv. 21. [c] Ad Rom. xvi. 3-15.

but the common Opinion [d]. *Irenæus* ſpeaks to the ſame Purpoſe: *The Apoſtles*, ſays he, *founding that Church, delivered the epiſcopal Office into the Hands of* Linus [e]. Hence the moſt antient Writers, who lived neareſt the Fountain of Tradition, never ſtile St. *Peter* Biſhop of *Rome*, but only ſay, that, by ordaining Biſhops, he founded that Church [f]. St. *Peter* therefore was not Biſhop of *Rome* in the ſtrict Senſe, to which that Word is now confined, but in the more large Senſe, of which I have taken notice above: and in that St. *Paul* hath as good a Claim to the high-ſounding Titles of *Pope*, *Biſhop of* Rome, *&c.* as St. *Peter*, ſince, together with him, he is ſaid to have founded that Church. The Popes indeed will not allow him that Honour, nor condeſcend to reckon him among their Predeceſſors; but *Epiphanius* and *Euſebius* have been more complaiſant; of whom the former ſays, Peter *and* Paul *were the firſt at* Rome, *both Biſhops and Apoſtles* [g]; and the latter, ſpeaking of the Succeſſion of the Biſhops of *Rome*, Alexander *derived his Suceſſion in the fifth Place from* Peter *and* Paul [h]. Both therefore were Biſhops of *Rome*, or neither; both in the Senſe of the antient Writers, but neither in that, which is now annexed to the Word *Biſhop*. And truly the Office of an Apoſtle, and that of a Biſhop, as the Word is now underſtood, are incompatible. An Apoſtle, ſays *Chryſoſtom* [i], is charged with the Inſtruction not of any particular Nation or City, but of the whole World; but a Biſhop muſt reſide, ſays the ſame Writer [k], and be employed in one Place: and therefore St. *Peter*, who knew theſe two Duties to be inconſiſtent, if he was ever at *Rome*, committed there, as he did in other Places, the epiſcopal Charge to others, and purſued his

In what Senſe St. Peter and St. Paul ſtyled Biſhops of Rome.

The Duties of a Biſhop and an Apoſtle inconſiſtent.

[d] Ruffin. in præfat. ad Clem. recogn. [e] Iren. apud Euſeb. c. 5. 6. [f] Conſtit. Apoſt. 7. 46. Iren. 3. 3. [g] Epiph, hær 7. [h] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 2. [i] Chryſ. tom. 8. p. 115. [k] Idem Eph. iv. 22.

his apoſtolical Office, which required a more extenſive Care.

Whether James *the Apoſtle was Biſhop of* Jeruſalem.

But St. *James*, ſay the Popiſh Writers, though an Apoſtle, was appointed Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*; and why might not St. *Peter*, though an Apoſtle, undertake the Epiſcopacy of *Rome*? It is ſurpriſing they ſhould lay ſo much Streſs, as they do, on this Objection, ſince they muſt know it to be grounded on an Uncertainty; as *Euſebius*, the greateſt Antiquary of former Times [l], *Hegeſippus*, the moſt antient Hiſtorian [m], *Epiphanius* [n], *Jerom* [o], *Gregory of Nyſſe* [p], *Chryſoſtom* [q], and many others, reckon *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, not among the Apoſtles, but the Seventy Diſciples. Of the ſame Opinion, among the Moderns, are *Grotius* [r], Dr. *Hammond* [s], *Valeſius* [t], *Blondel* [u], and *Salmaſius* [w]. The laſt of theſe ſaying, after his poſitive and confident manner, *It is certain that he was not one of the Twelve*: I may at leaſt ſay, it is not certain that he was; and conſequently the Objection can be of no conſiderable Weight. But allowing him to have been one of the Twelve, as ſome of the Antients ſeem to think [x], there was a ſpecial Reaſon, why one of the Apoſtles ſhould be appointed to reſide at *Jeruſalem*, that City being the Metropolis, the Fountain, the Centre of the Chriſtian Religion; our Faith had there had its Birth; the Church was there very numerous, conſiſting of many Thouſands of believing *Jews* [y]; and thither reſorted great Numbers of thoſe of that Nation, who were converted to Chriſt in other Countries. On theſe Conſiderations it might ſeem expedient that a Perſon of the greateſt Authority ſhould preſide there. But there was no ſpecial Reaſon why an Apoſtle ſhould conſtantly reſide at any

[l] Euſeb. lib. 1. cap. 12. [m] Hegeſ. apud Euſeb. l. 2, c. 23. [n] Epiph hær. 78. [o] Hier. de vir. ill. [r] Greg. p. 279. [q] Chryſ. in Matth. hom. 33. [r] Grat. in Jac. 1. 1. [s] Hamm. diſſert. Ignat. 4. 3. [t] Val. in Euſeb. 1. 12. [u] Blond. in Epiſt. Clem. ad Jacob. [w] Wal. Meſſ. p. 20. [x] Ang cont. Creſ. lib. 2, c. 37. Vide Pearſ. Ann. Paulin. p. 58. [y] Act. xxi. 20.

any other Place, nor does it appear that any did: St. *Peter* eſpecially could not reſide at any one Place, ſince to him, as *the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*, was committed the Charge of converting the diſperſed *Jews* in all Parts of the World.

As for the Appellations of the *Apoſtolic See*, *Chair*, *Throne*, &c. given by the Antients to the See of *Rome*, they import no more than that it was erected by an Apoſtle; for they are beſtowed indiſcriminately on all the Sees, in which Biſhops had been placed by the Apoſtles; *viz.* of *Epheſus* [z], of *Smyrna* [a], of *Alexandria* [b], of *Corinth*, *Theſſalonica*, *Philippi* [c], &c. The Title of *Apoſtolic See*, common to many, was, in Proceſs of Time, by the Ambition of the Biſhops of *Rome* appropriated to their own. They had, as they thought to the Year 1662. a pregnant Proof not only of St. *Peter*'s erecting their Chair, but of his ſitting in it himſelf; for till that Year, the very Chair, on which they believed, or would make others believe he had ſat, was ſhewn and expoſed to public Adoration on the 18th of *January*, the Feſtival of the ſaid Chair. But while it was cleaning, in order to be ſet up in ſome conſpicuous Place of the *Vatican*, the Twelve Labours of *Hercules* unluckily appeared engraved on it. Our Worſhip, however, ſays *Giacomo Bartolini*, who was preſent at this Diſcovery, and relateth it, was not miſplaced, ſince it was not to the Wood we paid it, but to the Prince of the Apoſtles St. *Peter* [c]. An Author of no mean Character, unwilling to give up the Holy Chair, even after this Diſcovery, as having a Place, and a peculiar Solemnity among the other Saints, hath attempted to explain the Labours of *Hercules* in a myſtical Senſe, as Emblems repreſenting the future Exploits of the *Popes* [d]. But the ridiculous and diſtorted Conceits of that Writer

What meant by the Apoſtolic See, Chair, Throne, *&c.*

[z] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [a] Idem. ib. et Tertull. de præſc. hæret. c. 3. Euſeb l. 3. c. 36. [b] Tertull. ib. c. 36. [c] Bartol. Antichità ſacre di Roma, p. 32. [d] Lucheſini catedra reſtituita a San Pietro.

Writer are not worthy our Notice, though by *Clement* X. they were not judged unworthy of a Reward.

St. Peter, *how or by whom, placed in the See of* Rome.

But to return to our Subject: it may be enquired, If St. *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, who placed him in that See? Did our Lord appoint him? Did the Apostles name him? Did the People choose him? Did he assume it himself? To these Queries no Answers have been yet given, but such as are so ridiculously weak, that it is not worth my while to relate them, nor the Readers to hear them. *Bellarmine*, in one Place, positively affirms, that *God commanded St.* Peter *to fix his See at* Rome [e]; but elsewhere contents himself with saying, *It is not improbable that God commanded St.* Peter *to fix his See at* Rome [f]. If it is no more than not improbable, it is uncertain; it may be a mere Conjecture, a Dream.

Other Bishops of Rome *appointed by St.* Peter.

St. *Peter*, either alone, or jointly with St. *Paul*, as we read in *Irenæus*, and in the Apostolical Constitutions [g], appointed other Bishops of *Rome*. Now, when he appointed others, did he resign his Episcopacy, or retain it? If he resigned it, he did not die Bishop of *Rome*; which shakes the very Foundation of the Pope's Claim to Supremacy: if he retained it, there were Two Bishops on the same See at one time; which Pope *Innocent* I. in his Epistle to the Clergy and People of *Constantinople*, condemned as an Irregularity never known till his Time [h]: he did not, it seems, recollect, that it had been practised by his Predecessor Pope *Peter*. *Theodoret* tells us, in his Ecclesiastical History, that when the Emperor *Constantius* would have had *Felix* to sit in the See of *Rome*, together with *Liberius*, upon the Return of the latter from Banishment, the Poeple of *Rome* would not consent to it, crying out, *One God, one Christ, one Bishop.*

[e] Bell. de sum. Pont. lib. 4. c. 4. [f] Idem ibid. lib. 2. c. 12. [g] Iren. apud. Eusеb. l. 5. c. 6. et Const. Apost. l. 7. c. 46. [h] Innoc. I. apud Soz. l. 8. c, 26.

Biſhop. *Felix* died ſoon after, and upon his Death *Theodoret* makes the following Remark: *It was*, ſays he, *a ſpecial Providence, that* Peter's *Throne might not ſuffer Infamy, being held by two Prelates* [i]. He did not conſider, or rather did not believe, that it had been held by St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, by St. *Peter* and by *Linus*.

To conclude, St. *Peter* was perhaps Biſhop at *Rome* not of *Rome* (B). He was Biſhop at *Rome*, if he ever was there, being in virtue of his Apoſtleſhip, impowered to diſcharge at *Rome*, and every where elſe, all epiſcopal Functions; but was not ſpecially Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other Place; that is, he did not take upon him the Charge of any particular Biſhop, the Adminiſtration of any particular Biſhoprick, that being inconſiſtent both with the Dignity and Office of an Apoſtle, or univerſal Biſhop.

St. Peter *Biſhop at* Rome *not of* Rome.

[i] Theod. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 17.

(B) 'Tis a Diſtinction made by a Pope, *King in* Etruria, *not of* Etruria.

NERO, GALBA, Otho, VITELLIUS, VESPASIAN, TITUS.

LINUS,

Firſt BISHOP *of* Rome.

THERE is a great Diſagreement among the Antients about the firſt Biſhops of *Rome*: *Tertullian* makes *Clement*, whom he ſuppoſes to have been ordained by St. *Peter*, the immediate *Succeſſor of that Apoſtle* [a]. He was followed therein by *Ruffinus* [b], and *Ruffinus* by the *Latins* in general; among whom that Opinion univerſally prevailed towards the End of the fourth Century. But *Jerom*, rejecting the Opinion of the *Latins*, places *Linus* immediately after the Apoſtles

Year of Chriſt 66. Linus *and not* Clemens, *the firſt Biſhop of* Rome.

[a] Tert. de præſc. hæret. c. 32. [b] Recog. p. 398.

Apoſtles, *Anacletus* next to him, and *Clement* in the third Place [c]. His Opinion is ſupported by the Authority of *Irenæus* [d], *Euſebius* [e], *Theodoret* [f], and likewiſe of *Epiphanius* [g], *Optatus Milevitanus* [h], and St. *Auſtin* [i], with this Difference, that *Epiphanius* gives the Name of *Cletus* to the Succeſſor of *Linus*, and both *Optatus* and St. *Auguſtin* place him after *Clement*; but in this they all agree, that *Linus* was the firſt, after the Apoſtles, who governed the Church of *Rome*. To the Authority of theſe Writers I may add that of the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions, telling us, in expreſs Terms, that *Linus* was ordained Biſhop of *Rome* by St. *Paul* [k]. As to what we read in *Tertullian* and *Ruffinus*, *viz.* that *Clement* was ordained by St. *Peter*, and named to ſucceed him, Dr. *Hammond* anſwers, That *Clement* governed with epiſcopal Power and Juriſdiction the converted *Jews*, while *Linus* and *Anacletus* governed with the ſame Power, the converted Gentiles. He adds, That upon the Death of *Anacletus*, both Churches were united under him [l]. Thus he ſtrives to reconcile the Opinion of the *Latins*, placing *Clement* immediately after the Apoſtles, with that of the *Greeks*, allowing him only the third Place: for granting what he advances to be true, and Reaſons are not wanting to ſupport it, *Clement* was, agreeably to the Opinion of the *Latins*, the immediate Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, with reſpect to the *Jews*; but with reſpect to the Gentiles, he ſucceeded *Anacletus*, agreeably to the Opinion of the *Greeks* [m]. This Anſwer *Cotelerius* applauds as an ingenious, learned, and probable Solution; but, at the ſame time rejects it as contradicting, in his Opinion, the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions, and not ſupported by the Authority of any antient Writer [n]. The learned Dr. *Pearſon*

Whether Clement *appointed by St.* Peter *to ſucceed him.*

[c] Hier. vir. illuſt. c. 15. [d] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Euſeb. l. 3, c. 2. 4. 21. [f] Theod. in 2 Tim. iv. 21. [g] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6. [h] Optat. l. 2. p. 48. [i] Aug. ep. 165. [k] Conſt. Apoſt. l. 7. c. 46. Hamm. l. 5. c. 1. [m] Idem ibid. p. 247. 258. [n] Cotel. in not. Conſt. p. 298.

Dr. *Pearſon* will admit no Opinion that ſuppoſes Two Biſhops to have preſided together in one City [o], that being an Irregularity, according to St. *Cyprian* [p], *contrary to the Eccleſiaſtical Diſpoſition, contrary to the Evangelical Law, contrary to the Rules of the Catholic Inſtitution*, and condemned as ſuch by the Council of *Nice* [q]. It is very much to be doubted, as I have ſhewn above, whether St. *Peter* ever was at *Rome*, and conſequently whether *Clement* was ordained, by him, Biſhop of that City. His not ſucceeding him is a Proof, that he was not; for who can imagine, that the People and Clergy of thoſe Days would have thought of chooſing any other, or that any other, though choſen, would have accepted of a Dignity to which *Clement* had been named by St. *Peter* himſelf, and which he was actually poſſeſſed of at the Apoſtle's Death? Be that as it will, *Linus* is now univerſally acknowledged both by the *Greeks* and *Latins* for the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*.

As for the Life and actions of *Linus*, all I can find in the Antients concerning him is, that it was he whom St. *Paul* mentioned in his Epiſtle to *Timothy* [r]; that, upon the Authority of the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions, he was ſuppoſed by ſome to have been the Son of *Claudia*, whom the Apoſtle mentions in the ſame Place [f]; and that his Life and Converſation were much approved of by the People [t]. The Church of *Rome* allows him, in the Canon of the Maſs, a Place among the Martyrs; but no mention is made of his having ſuffered for the Faith, either in the antient Martyrologies, or in *Irenæus*, who, ſpeaking of him, and his immediate Succeſſors, diſtinguiſhes none but *Teleſphorus* with the Title of Martyr. *Baronius*, determined to maintain, right or wrong the Credit of the ſacred Canon, in Oppoſition

Linus no Martyr tho' placed among the Martyrs.

o Pearſ. poſthum. p. 159, 161. p Cypr. ep. 44, 46, 52. 55. q Syn. Nic. can. 8. r Iren. l. 3. c. 5. Euſeb. l. 3. c. 2. Tim. iv. 21. f Conſt. Apoſt. l. 7. c. 46. t. Tert. in Mar. c. 3.

tion to all the Antients, nay, and to his own Syſtem, cuts off one Year from the Pontificate of *Linus*, that he may place his Death under *Veſpaſian*, and not, as *Euſebius* hath done [u], under *Titus*, in whoſe Reign he owns none to have ſuffered for the Faith [w]. Had he remembered what he muſt have read in *Tertullian*, and *Euſebius*, he had ſaved himſelf that Trouble; for *Tertullian* aſſureth us, that *Veſpaſian* made no Laws againſt the Chriſtians [x]; and *Euſebius*, that he did not moleſt them, though he cauſed a diligent Search to be made after thoſe who were of the Race of *David*, which occaſioned a dreadful Perſecution againſt the *Jews* [y]. *Linus* governed the Church of *Rome*, according to *Euſebius* [z] and *Epiphanus* [a], Twelve Years, ſo that, if we place, with them, the Death of St. *Peter*, in 66, *Linus* muſt have died in the Year 78, of the Chriſtian Æra. We have, under the Name of *Linus*, Two Books of the Martyrdom of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* [b]; but they are generally looked upon as ſuppoſititious [c]. *Trithemius* makes him the Author of the Life of St. *Peter*, in which a particular Account was given of the Diſpute between that Apoſtle and *Simon* the Magician. This Piece hath not reached our Times, and was perhaps of the ſame Stamp with the other, ſince it is never mentioned either by *Euſebius* or St. *Jerom*. The Decrees, that are aſcribed to him, are no where to be found, but in *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, and ſuch like Writers, whoſe Authority is of no Weight in Matters ſo diſtant, unleſs ſupported by the Teſtimony of the Antients.

Books aſcribed to him.

CLETUS,

[u] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 13. [w] Bar. Annal. ad Ann. 80. [x] Tert. apol. c. 5. [y] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 12. [z] Idem. ib. c. 13. [a] Epiph. l. 27. c. 6. [b] Bib. Patr. tom. 7. [c] Vide Baron. ad Ann. 69. et Voſſ. Hiſt. Græc. l. 2. c. 9.

TITUS, CLETUS, *or* ANACLETUS, DOMITIAN.

Second BISHOP *of* Rome.

LINUS was ſucceeded by *Cletus*, or *Anacletus*, whom the *Greeks* conſtantly ſtyle *Anencletus*, that is, *Irreprehenſible*. An Opinion hath long obtained in the Church of *Rome*, diſtinguiſhing *Cletus* and *Anacletus* as Two Popes, nay as Two Saints; the Feſtival of the one being kept on the 26th of *April*, and that of the other on the 23d of *July* [a]. But this Diſtinction is now given up by the moſt learned Men of that Church, not only as groundleſs, but as plainly contradicting the moſt celebrated Writers of Antiquity, *Irenæus*, *Euſebius*, and St. *Jerom*, to whom we may add *Caius*, a Prieſt of *Rome*, who writing in the Beginning of the third Century, reckoned *Victor* the Thirteenth Biſhop of that City [b]. *Baronius*, however ſpareth no Pains to keep up that Diſtinction; but allegeth nothing to countenance it except the Poem againſt *Marcion*, aſcribed to *Tertullian*, the Pontifical of *Anaſtaſius*, and ſome Martyrologies [c]. Who was the Author of that Poem is not well known, but all agree, that it was not written by *Tertullian* [d]. Beſides, the Author, whoever he was, placeth both *Cletus* and *Anacletus* before *Clement*; which *Baronius* condemneth as a groſs Miſtake. As for the Pontifical, the Annaliſt often finds fault with it; and complainth, in this very Place, that *Anaſtaſius*'s whole Chronology is overcaſt with an impenetrable Miſt [e]. The Martyrologies he quoteth are of too modern a Date to deſerve any Regard, ſince none of them were heard of before the ninth Century [f].

Year of Chriſt 78.

Cletus *and* Anacletus *not two, but one Pope.*

[a] Martyrol. Roman. [b] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. Pearſon poſthum. pag. 147, 148. [c] Bar. ad Ann. 69. [d] Halloix in vit. Iren. p. 646. [e] Bar. ad Ann. 69.

How they were first distinguished.

tury [f]. But how, says *Baronius*, was this Distinction first introduced? We may, perhaps, account for it thus: *Irenæus*, with all the *Greeks*, and St. *Jerom*, among the *Latins*, place *Anacletus*, as we have observed above, before *Clement*; whereas St. *Austin* and *Optatus Milevitanus* place him after. This, and his being called *Cletus* by *Epiphanius*, and in several Copies of *Rufinus*, might induce some to imagine, that as the Names and Places were different, so were the Persons. Thus, as we conjecture, of one Pope Two Popes were made, Two Saints and Two Martyrs; for, in the Canon of the Mass, he hath a Place with *Linus* among the Martyrs; though neither was acknowledged for such by *Irenæus*, or any of the Antients; nay, *Anacletus* is said, in some Pontificals, to have *died in Peace*, that is, according to the Phrase of those Days, of a natural Death [g]. *Bollandus*, after having much laboured, but laboured in vain, to maintain the Distinction between *Cletus* and *Anacletus*, yields at last, and gives up the Point. But yet, unwilling to make the least Alteration in the Catalogue of the Popes, which places, with the Approbation of the holy See, *Clement* between *Cletus* and *Anacletus*, he strives to save it with a new and pretty extraordinary Invention; for he pretends *Anacletus* or *Cletus* to have resigned the Chair to *Clement*, and *Clement* in his Turn, to have yielded it to him again. Thus, according to him, though *Cletus* and *Anacletus* are one and the same Person, yet no Fault is to be found with the Catalogue; and *Clement* is rightly placed both after and before him [h]. This is a Speculation of his own, altogether groundless, and therefore not worty of a Place here, were it not to shew what low Shifts and Subterfuges even Men of Parts, in the Church of *Rome*, choose to submit to, rather than to yield to Reason in Points that seem to derogate

[f] Polland. Pont. p. 217. [g] Vide Pearson posthum. p. 19.
[h] Bolland. Pont. p. 217.

gate from the Authority of that See. *Anacletus* governed the Church Twelve Years, according to *Euſebius*[i]; to which ſome add Two Months, ſome Three, and ſome only One; ſo that he muſt have died in the Year 91. He is ſuppoſed to have been buried next to St. *Peter*, in the *Vatican*, where his ſuppoſed Body is ſhewn, and worſhipped to this Day[k]. We find, in the Collection of *Iſidorus Mercator*, Three Decretals, under the Name of *Cletus*; but ſuch Decretals as are anterior to the Pontificate of Pope *Syricius*, who was elected in the Year 384, are now univerſally looked upon as bare-faced Forgeries[l] (A).

Decretals aſcribed to him.

CLE-

[i] Euſeb, lib. 3, cap. 15. [k] Bolland. 26 April. p. 410, 411.
[l] Vide Card. Bon. liturg. l. 1. c. 3. et Natal. Alexand. Hiſt. Eccleſ. p. 743, &c.

(A) All the decretal Epiſtles of the Popes, before *Syricius*, are ſo filled with Abſurdities, Contradictions, Anachroniſms, *&c.* that they are now given up, even by the moſt ſanguine Advocates for the Papal Supremacy. And yet theſe very Decretals, abſurd as they are, and inconſiſtent with themſelves, as well as with all the genuine Writings of thoſe Times, whether ſacred or profane, were, for ſeveral Ages, the main Stays of the whole Fabric of the Papal Power. By them that Power was eſtabliſhed; by them it was ſupported; for, in the Days of Ignorance, they were univerſally received as the genuine Writings of the antient Biſhops of *Rome*, in whoſe Names they were publiſhed. And, truly, were we to rank them, as they were ranked in the monkiſh and ignorant Ages, with the Deciſions of the Oecumenical Councils, and the Canonical Books of the Scripture, no room would be left to queſtion any Branch of the unlimited Power claimed by the Popes. They were held in the greateſt Eſteem and Veneration from the Beginning of the 9th Century to the Time of the Reformation, when, upon the firſt Dawn of Learning, the Cheat was diſcovered, and the Stays removed, which till then had ſupported the unwieldy Edifice. But it was then in a Condition to ſtand by itſelf, at leaſt till new Frauds were deviſed to prop it up; and this was accordingly done, without Loſs of Time.

The Decretals of the firſt Popes are quoted by *Bellarmine*, to prove, that the Supremacy of the Biſhops of *Rome* was univerſally acknowledged in the earlieſt Times (2): but, at the ſame time, he

(2) Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 14.

DOMITIAN, NERVA, TRAJAN.

CLEMENT,

Third BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 91.

Clement *mentioned by* St. Paul.

CLEMENT, the Succeſſor of *Anacletus*, is, according to *Origen*[a], *Euſebius*[b], and all the Antients, the Perſon whom St. *Paul*, in his Epiſtle to the *Philippians*[c], names among thoſe who had *laboured*

[a] Origen. in Jo. p. 143. [b] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 15. [c] Philipp. iv. 3.

he owns, that *he dares not affirm them to be of undoubted Authority.* And what can be more abſurd than to quote a Forgery, or what he himſelf owns may be a Forgery, in Vindication of ſo darling a Point as *the Supremacy?* But he did it for want of better Evidences, and muſt therefore be excuſed. *Baronius*, aſhamed to lay any Streſs on ſuch groſs and palpable Forgeries, contents himſelf with only ſaying, that the Popes had no hand in forging them; and that they never made uſe of their Authority to ſupport their own. That they were concerned in, or privy to, the forging of thoſe Letters, I dare not affirm: but that they countenanced them, as they did all other Forgeries tending to the Advancement of their See; that they received them as genuine, and endeavoured to impoſe them upon others; nay, that they made uſe of them ſoon after their firſt Appearance in the World, to eſtabliſh and promote the Authority of their See, are undoubted Matters of Fact: witneſs the Letter, which *Nicholas* I. wrote, in the Year 865, to *Hincmarus* Archbiſhop of *Rheims*, and to the other Biſhops of *France*, who, refuſing to comply with ſome exorbitant Demands of the Pope, had rejected the Decretals, on which thoſe Demands were founded, as Writings that had been lately counterfeited. *Nicholas*, in his Anſwer to them, maintains the Authenticity of thoſe Letters, exhorts all, who profeſs the Catholic Faith, to receive them *with due Veneration*, and claimeth, in virtue of ſuch ſacred and authentic Writings, an uncontrouled Authority over all the Churches of the World, as lodged from the Beginning in his See (3). And was not this making uſe of the ſuppoſed Authority of thoſe Decretals to promote his own? *Nicholas* ſeemeth to have believed the Letters to be genuine; and, if he did, he was certainly miſtaken, and erred in propoſing, as he doth, ſpurious Pieces for a *firm and ſtrong Foundation* of our Belief, as well as our Practice. If he did not believe them to be genuine,

(3) Nich. I. Ep. 42.

boured with him in the Goſpel, and whoſe Names were in the Book of Life. Hence *Chryſoſtom* concludes, that together with St. *Luke* and *Timothy*, he attended the Apoſtle of the Gentiles in all his Journeys [d]. *Irenæus* aſſureth us, that he had not only ſeen the Apoſtles, and converſed with them; but that, when he was appointed Biſhop of *Rome*, he ſtill heard their Voices ſounding in his Ears, ſtill had before his Eyes the Rules and good Example they had given him [e]. *Origen* ſtyleth him *the Diſciple of the Apoſtles* [f]; *Ruffinus, almoſt an Apoſtle* [g]; and *Clement* of *Alexandria*, *an*

[d] Chryſ. in Phil. hom. 13. [e] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [f] Orig. Pr. in l. 3. c. 3. [g] Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195.

genuine, and yet endeavoured to perſuade the Biſhops of *France* that they were ſo; nay, and claimed, upon the Authority of ſuch Pieces, a Power over them and their Churches; a worſe Epithet would ſuit him better than that of *fallible*, which is common to all Men.

The firſt who publiſhed theſe Decretals, was, according to *Hincmarus*, *Riculphus* Biſhop of *Mentz*, who was ſuppoſed to have brought them from *Spain*; becauſe the Name of *Iſidore* was prefixed to the Collection, and a famous Writer of that Name, *viz.* *Iſidore* Biſhop of *Seville*, had flouriſhed in *Spain* ſome Centuries before. But ſuch a mean and ſcandalous Undertaking is altogether unworthy of ſo great a Prelate; and beſides, the Author of the ſuppoſed Decretals hath copied, *verbatim*, ſome Paſſages from the Council of *Toledo* in 675, and from the Sixth Council in 681, whereas *Iſidore* of *Seville* died in 636. The learned *Ellies du Pin* lays this Forgery at the door of ſome *German* or *Frenchman*, the Letters being all written in the Style of the *Germans* and *French*, of the 9th Century, and many of them addreſſed to Perſons of theſe two Nations. *Hincmarus* was miſtaken, in ſuppoſing the forged Decretals to have been firſt publiſhed by *Riculphus* of *Mentz*; for in ſome of them are found Fragments of the Council held at *Paris* in 829, and he died in 814. They were firſt uſhered into the World, and forged too, in all likelihood, by one *Benedict*, Deacon of the Church of *Mentz*, though, in his Preface to that Collection, he would fain make us believe, that *Autcarius*, in whoſe Time *Benedict* publiſhed his Collection, is thought to have been privy to the Impoſture. The Name of *Iſidore*, which was then very common in *Spain*, was prefixed to it, to perſuade the World, that the Decretals were brought from that Country, and not forged at *Mentz*, where they firſt appeared. However, they

an Apoſtle [h]. That he was well verſed in every Branch of Learning, eſpecially in polite Literature, deſcended of a Senatorian Family, and nearly related to the *Cæſars*, is what we read in *Eucherius* [i] and *Nilus* [k], who ſeem to have followed therein the *Recognitions*, a Book of no Authority. *Eucherius* perhaps confounded, as others have done, Pope *Clement* with *Flavius Clemens*, who was Son to *Flavius Sabinus*, the only Brother of *Veſpaſian*, and ſuffered Death for the Chriſtian Religion in the Perſecution of *Domitian* [l]; for Pope *Clement* was, as himſelf ſeems to inſinuate, rather of the Race of *Jacob* than of the *Cæſars* [m]. Upon the Death of *Anacletus* he was unanimouſly choſen by the People and Clergy of *Rome* to ſucceed him. He had been named, ſay ſome, to that Dignity by St. *Peter* himſelf, preferably to *Linus* and *Anacletus* [n]; but he declined it, finding that the Faithful were not all equally diſpoſed to ſubmit to the Judgment and Authority of St. *Peter*. He therefore withdrew

Some confound him with Flavius Clemens

Choſen Biſhop of Rome.

[h] Clem. ſtrom. 4. [i] Euch. ad. Val. p. 19. [k] Nil. l. 2. ep. 49. [l] Dio, lib. 65. Sueton. in Dom. c. 15. Orig. in Celſ. l. 1. p. 5. [m] Clem. ep. 1. c. 4. [n] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6.

they were ſuſpected by ſome, even in that dark Age, and abſolutely rejected by *Hincmarus* of *Rheims*, as Writings of no Authority. But the Popes, whoſe Pretenſions they were calculated to favour, exerting all their Authority to bring them into Repute, they were in the End univerſally received, and inſerted into all the Collections of Canons. At preſent they are ſo univerſally exploded, that there is not a ſingle Writer, no, not even in the Church of *Rome*, who is not aſhamed to patronize or defend them. But the Work is done, for which they were intended; and now that the Edifice can ſtand by itſelf, no matter what becomes of the Stays that ſupported it, when it could not. Theſe Decretals may be juſtly looked upon as a ſtanding Monument of the Ignorance, Superſtition, and Credulity, that univerſally prevailed in the Church, from the Beginning of the Ninth Century to the Time of the Reformation. I ſhall conclude with obſerving, that, from the Concluſion of theſe Decretals, *Anaſtaſius the Bibliothecarian*, and after him *Platina*, have chiefly copied what they relate of the firſt Popes, ſuppoſing them to have really done, what, in thoſe ſpurious Pieces, they are ſaid to have done.

withdrew; and, as he was of a mild and pacific Diſpoſition, led a retired Life to the Death of *Anacletus*, when he was forced to accept of the Dignity, which he had before declined. Thus *Ruffinus*, upon the Authority of the *Recognitions*; which appears to me, I muſt own, a very improbable Tale. During his Pontificate happened an impious and deteſtable Diviſion, to uſe his own Terms, among the Chriſtians of *Corinth*, which obliged them to have recourſe to other Churches, eſpecially to that of *Rome*; and on this occaſion was written that Famous Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, ſo much magnified by the Antients, and publickly read, not only in the Church of *Corinth*, as *Dionyſius* aſſures us, who was Biſhop of that City in 180, but in many other Churches, to the Time of *Euſebius*, and St. *Jerom*[o] and perhaps long after. It was by ſome ranked among the Canonical Books of the Scripture, and by all reverenced next to them[p]. It was written in the Name of the whole Church of *Rome*, and to the whole Church it is, in expreſs Terms, aſcribed by *Irenæus*[q] and *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, who calls it the Epiſtle of the *Romans* to the *Corinthians*[r]. However, it was compoſed by *Clement*, in the Name of the Church; for, in the primitive Times, Biſhops did nothing by themſelves, but every thing jointly with their Churches: *We adviſe*, *we exhort*, *we recommend*, &c. was their uſual Style; which the Popes ſtill obſerve, though they mean only themſelves; for they ſcorn to join either with the People or Clergy. The Style of this excellent Letter is plain, clear, full of Energy, without any uſeleſs Ornaments; and the Whole written with the Simplicity, as *Photius* obſerves[s], that the Church requires in Eccleſiaſtical Writers. There is ſo great an Affinity, both as to the Senſe and the Words, between this Epiſtle, and the

His famous Epiſtle to the Corinthians.

[o] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 16. Hier. vir. ill. c. 15. [p] Vide Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Euſeb. lib. 3. c. 16. et 38. et l. 4. c. 23. [q] Iren. ibid. [r] Clem. ſtrom. 5. [s] Phot. c. 126.

the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that some have concluded *Clement* to have been the Translator, nay, and the Author of that Epistle [t]. In *Clement*'s Epistle *Photius* discovers, as he thinks, Three Faults; *viz*, that he supposes other Worlds beyond the Ocean; that he speaks of the Phœnix as a real Bird; and that he uses Words expressing the Humanity of our Saviour, and not his Divinity. But, as to the first of these Objections, there can be no Difficulty now, that we know for certain that was but doubtfully advanced by the Antients: in speaking of the Phœnix he complies with the Opinion universally received, in those Days, by the Learned, both among the Christians and Pagans. As to the Third Objection, *Photius* must not have observed, that he styles our Saviour's Sufferings the *Sufferings of God*, which was acknowledging his Divinity. This Epistle, the most precious and valuable Treasure the Church can boast, after the holy Scriptures, was for many Ages bewailed as lost; but, in 1933, it was again restored to the Christian World by *Patricius Junius*, a *North-Briton*, who published it from a Manuscript, written by an *Egyptian* Lady, named *Thecla*, about the Time of the great Council of *Nice*, and afterwards brought over into *England* [u]. That this Piece is genuine, appears from a great many Passages quoted out of it by the Antients.

Unjustly criticized by Photius.

Thought lost, but appears again.

The most remarkable Event that happened in the Pontificate of *Clement*, was the Persecution of *Domitian*; but what Part he bore in it we can learn from no credible Author. He died, according to *Eusebius* [w], in the Third Year of *Trajan*'s Reign, that is, in the 103d of the Christian Æra. In the Canon of the Mass he has a Place, with his Two Predecessors, among the Martyrs; but *Telesphorus*, the Sixth Bishop of *Rome*, is the first, as I have observed above, who was acknowledged as such by *Irenæus*, whose Authority

Clement *dies*.

t Euseb. l. 3. c. 38. et l. 6. c. 25. Hier. vir ill. c 15. u Not. Jun. p. 3. Not. Cotel. p. 8. w Euseb. l. 3. c. 34.

Authority is of far greater Weight than that of *Ruffinus*, or Pope *Zosimus*, who suppose him to have died for the Confession of the Faith [x]. In the Acts of *Clement*, to which *Gregory* of *Tours* gave an entire Credit [y], and after him many others, especially the Two credulous Annalists, *Baronius* [z], and *Alford* [a] in his Annals of the *British* Church, we read, that *Clement* was banished, by *Trajan*, into the *Chersonesus*, beyond the *Euxine* Sea; that there he caused a Fountain to spring up miraculously, for the Relief of the Christians confined to the same unhospitable Region; that he converted the whole Country to the Faith, which provoked the Emperor to such a degree, that he ordered him to be thrown into the Sea, with an Anchor fastened to his Neck: it is added, that, on the Anniversary of his Death, the Sea retired to the Place where he had been drowned, though Three long Miles from the Shore; that, upon its retiring, there appeared a most magnificent Temple, all of the finest Marble; and in the Temple a stately Monument, in which was found the Body of the Saint; that the Sea continued thus retiring every Year on the same Day, not daring, for the Space of Seven Days, to return to its usual Bounds, that the Christians might, at their Leisure, and without Apprehension of Danger, perform their Devotions in Honour of the Saint: to crown the Whole, they add, that, one Year, a Mother having heedlessly left her young Child in the Temple, upon her Return next Year, she found it not only alive, but in perfect Health [b]. No mention is made of such stupendous Miracles by *Irenæus*, who was brought up under *Polycarp*, Bishop of *Smyrna*, in *Asia*, at the very Time *Clement* is supposed to have suffered, and who speaks of him at Length. His Silence is a plain Demonstration

His fabulous Acts.

The Miracles he wrought, unknown to Irenæus.

[x] Ruf. orig. t. 1. pag. 778. Concil. per Lab. t. 2. p. 1558.
[y] Greg. Tur. de glor. martyr. c. 35. [z] Baron. ad Ann. 102.
[a] Alf. ad Ann. eund. [b] Greg. Tur. ib.

stration that they were unknown to him; and they must have been known, had they been true.

Other Writings ascribed to Clement.

Besides the Letter to the *Corinthians*, of which I have spoken above, several other Pieces are ascribed to *Clement*; *viz*, a second Letter to the *Corinthians*; which is, without all Doubt, very antient; but *Eusebius* doubts whether it was written by *Clement* [c]; and both St. *Jerom* [d], and *Photius* [e], absolutely reject it.

A second Letter to the Corinthians.

Five other Letters.

Five other Letters, placed among the Decretals, whereof the first, more antient than the rest, was translated by *Ruffinus*, and is quoted by the Council of *Vaison*, held in 442 [f]. However, it is generally looked upon as a spurious Piece; for the Author of it, whoever he was, acquaints St. *James*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who died long before St. *Peter*, with St. *Peter*'s Death [g]. *Clement*'s Itinerary, which, in *Photius*'s Time, was prefixed, by way of Preface, to the *Recognitions* [h]. The *Recognitions*, relating, under the Name of *Clement*, the Actions of St. *Peter*, his Interview with *Simon* the Magician, how *Clement* himself knew again his Father and his Brothers, whom he had forgot; whence the whole Work took the Name of *Recognitians*, that is, *of knowing again*: it is likewise called the *Itinerary of St.* Peter, the *Acts of St.* Peter, the *Acts of St.* Clement [i]. The *Recognitions* are quoted by *Origen* [k], *Epiphanius* [l], and *Ruffinus* [m], as the Work of *Clement*; but these Writers, at the same time, own them to have been altered in several Places, and falsified by the Heretics; nay, *Epiphanius* tells us, that the *Ebionites* scarce left any thing sound in them [n]. The Author was well versed in Philosophy, Mathematics, Astrology, and most other Sciences, but not so well acquainted with the Doctrine of

His Itinerary.

The Recognitions.

[c] Euseb. l. 3. c. 38. [d] Hier. vir. ill. c. 15. [e] Phot. c. 113.
[f] Concil. per. Labb. t. 3. p. 1458. [g] Vide Blond. Decret. p. 25. 28. [h] Phot. c. 113. [i] Coteler. not. in script. Apost. p. 353.
[k] Orig. Philocal. cap 23. p. 81. 82. [l] Epiph. hær. 30. c. 15.
[m] Ruf. ad Orig. p. 195. [n] Epiph. hær. 30. p. 65.

of the Church; whence his Work is abſolutely rejected by *Athanaſius* [o]; and now generally looked upon as a Piece falſly aſcribed to *Clement*. St. *Peter*'s *Dialogues* with *Apion*, were probably written in the Third Century, and, to gain Credit, fathered upon *Clement*; for *Euſebius* writes, that there had lately appeared a long Work, under the Name of *Clement*, containing Dialogues between St. *Peter* and *Apion* [p]. *St. Peter's Dialogues with Apion.*

As to the *Apoſtolic Conſtitutions*, if that Work is different from *the Doctrine of the Apoſtles*, mentioned by *Athanaſius* and *Euſebius*; *Epiphanius* is the firſt who ſpeaketh of it: it appeareth at leaſt, from *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, that, in the Year 250, the Conſtitutions either had not yet appeared, or were of no Repute in the Church [q]. *Epiphanius* tells us, that many ſuſpected them; but, as for himſelf, he received them, ſince he found nothing in them repugnant to the Faith, or the Diſcipline of the Church [r]. But as he quoteth ſeveral Paſſages out of them, which are not to be found now, we may well conclude, that, ſince his Time, they have been either altered or curtailed. The *Greeks* indeed, in the Second Canon of the Council, that, in 692, was held at *Conſtantinople*, in a Tower of the Imperial Palace, called *Trullus*, that is, the *Cupola*, declare, that they had been falſified, in ſeveral Places, by the Heretics. *Photius* thinks, that, with reſpect to the Style, they fall ſhort of the *Recognitions*, but far excel them in the Purity of the Doctrine, adding, at the ſame time, that it is no eaſy Taſk to clear them from the Imputation of *Arianiſm* [s]. Dr. *Pearſon* takes them to be a Collection of ſeveral Pieces, publiſhed in the earlieſt Times, under the Name of the Apoſtles, and containing, as was pretended, the Inſtructions they had given [t]. *Albaſpinæus*, Biſhop of *Orange*, thinks the Matter they contain excellent, and *The Apoſtolic Conſtitutions.*

[o] Athan. ſym. p. 154. [p] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 38. [q] Ign. prol. c. 8. p. 54. [r] Epiph. hær. 76. p. 822. [s] Phot. c. 113. [t] Pearſ. in Ign. t. 1. p. 60, 61.

and the Whole agreeable to the Discipline observed by the *Greek* Church, during the Four first Centuries; but nevertheless he looketh upon them only as a Collection of the different Customs, that were established, by Degrees, in the Church, and some of which were disputed even in the Fourth Century [u]; so that they can by no means be ascribed either to the Apostles, or to *Clement*. The *Constitutions* end with 85 Canons, long known by the Title of *the Canons of the Apostles*; but, as they contain several Things that were not received in the Apostles Time, nor in *Clement*'s, the ablest Critics are of Opinion, that they likewise are but a Collection of several Decrees made in the first Ages of the Church, and that they were not collected into one Body till the Third Century [w]. I do not find them quoted before the Council of *Constantinople* in 394. The *Greeks*, in the Council of the Year 692, mentioned above, bound themselves to the Observance of them; but they are all rejected by Pope *Galasius*: however, *Dionysius Exiguus* having, not long after, placed the first Fifty at the Head of his Collection, they were received by Degrees; but the other Thirty-five have not been admitted to this Day.

The Canons of the Apostles.

Upon the Whole, of the many Writings ascribed to *Clement*, the first Letter to the *Corinthians* is the only one undoubtedly his: and what a wide Difference appeareth, as to the Spirit and Style, between that excellent Piece, and the Briefs, Bulls, Mandates, *&c.* of his Successors? He doth not command, but exhorteth; he doth not threaten, but intreateth; he doth not thunder Anathemas and Excommunications, but employs the most mild and gentle Persuasives, even with the Authors of the Schism. Had he known himself to be the infallible and unerring Judge of Controversies, from whose Tribunal lay no Appeal;

Clement's Infallibility unknown to him, and to the Corinthians.

[u] Alb. Obser. l. 1. c. 3. p. 37, 38. [w] Idem ib. et Ign. prol. c. 15. p. 103.

Appeal; had the *Corinthians* believed themſelves bound, on Pain of Damnation, to ſubmit to his Deciſions, there had been no Room for Reaſons, Arguments, and Perſuaſives; he ought to have exerted the Power, with which he was veſted, and put an End to all Diſputes, in the peremptory Style of his Succeſſors. *We declare and command all Men to comply with this our Declaration, on Pain of incurring the Indignation of the Almighty*; *and*, as if that were not enough, *of his bleſſed Apoſtles* Peter *and* Paul. But it was not until ſome Ages after, that the Popes found out their Infallibility, or rather their flattering Divines found it out for them; ſo that this invaluable Privilege lying dormant, Men were obliged, for a long time, to make uſe of their Reaſon, in deciding religious Controverſies.

TRAJAN.

EVARISTUS,

Fourth BISHOP *of* Rome.

CLEMENT was ſucceeded by *Evariſtus*, *Evariſtes*, or *Ariſtus*, as he is called in the moſt antient Catalogue of the Popes [a], in the Third Year of *Trajan*'s Reign, that is, in the Cloſe of the Firſt Century of the Chriſtian Æra. He governed about Nine Years, that is, to the Twelfth Year of *Trajan*, and the 109 of Chriſt [b]. *Euſebius*, in his Chronicles, ſuppoſeth him to have died in the Year 107 [c]; and, in his Hiſtory, ſays, that his Death happened about the Year 109 [d]: but, in the Series and Succeſſion of the Popes, that Writer is every where conſiſtent with himſelf in his Hiſtory, and quite otherwiſe in his Chro-

Year of Chriſt 100.

Evariſtus *governs Nine Years.*

[a] Buch. p. 207. [b] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 34. [c] Euſeb. chron. l. 4. c. 1. [d] Idem l. 3. c. 34.

Chronicle. Besides, the History ought to correct the Chronicle, as being posterior to it. To *Evaristus* are ascribed Two Decretals, Two Distributions of the Titles or Parishes of *Rome*, on which *Baronius* maketh a long Descant [e], and an Order, that Bishops, when they preached, should be always attended by Seven Deacons [f]. But these, and many other things of the same Nature, we read only in *Baronius*, *Platina*, *Anastasius*, *Ciaconius*, &c. and my Design is, as I have declared in the Preface, to follow the Antients alone, in the History of the antient Popes; and therefore I shall take no notice of what the Moderns advance, unless I find it supported by the Authority of the original Writers.

Several things ascribed to him, without sufficient Foundation.

TRAJAN, **ALEXANDER,** ADRIAN.

Fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 109.

SIXTUS is placed, by *Optatus Milevitanus* [g], immediately after *Evaristus*; but that is certainly a Mistake, owing, in all likelihood, to those who transcribed him, since *Irenæus* [h], *Eusebius* [i], *Epiphanius* [k], and even St. *Austin* [l], who follows *Optatus* in every thing else relating to the Popes, place *Alexander* the Fifth Bishop of *Rome*; so that we agree with the most authentic and unexceptionable Writer of Antiquity in excluding St. *Peter*, and supposing *Cletus* and *Anacletus* to be one and the same Person [m]. *Alexander* governed Ten Years and some Months, and died in the Third Year of *Adrian*, and 119 of Christ [n]. We can learn nothing of the Antients concerning him: he is worshipped indeed by the Church

[e] Bar. Ann. 112. [f] Idem, ann. 121. [g] Opt. l. 2. p. 48.
[h] Iren. l. 3. c. 6. [i] Euseb. l. 4. c. 1. [k] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6.
[l] Aug. ep. 165. [m] Euseb. l. 5. c. 6. [n] Idem, l. 4. c. 5.

Church of *Rome* as a Martyr; but that Title is not given him by *Irenæus*: and as for the venerable *Bede*, who ranketh him among the Martyrs, he was led into that Miſtake by *The Acts of St. Alexander*, which, in the Opinion of Dr. *Pearſon*, were compoſed in the Seventh Century, but are now univerſally rejected as fabulous. *Platina* aſcribeth to Pope *Alexander* the Inſtitution of *Holy Water* [o], which *Baronius* taketh very much amiſs of him, ſince he thereby robs the Apoſtles of an Honour due to them; for by the Apoſtles, in his Opinion, was firſt introduced the Uſe of *Holy Water* [p]. But if we trace up this *Holy Water* to the Fountain-head, we ſhall find that it ariſeth from an unhallowed Spring, from the *Luſtral Water* of the Pagans; for Peace being reſtored to the Church by *Conſtantine*, the Chriſtians began, as a modern Writer well obſerveth [q], to adopt the Ceremonies of the *Gentiles*. Several Cities in *Italy*, *France*, *Germany*, *Spain*, &c. pretend to have Reliques of this Pope, inſomuch, that, were they all put together, they would form at leaſt twenty intire Bodies [r].

Alexander not a Martyr.

The Inſtitution of Holy Water falſly aſcribed to him.

ADRIAN.

SIXTUS,

Sixth BISHOP *of* Rome.

THE Succeſſor of *Alexander* is named *Sixtus* by *Optatus* [s], and St. *Auguſtin* [t]; but by *Irenæus* [u], *Euſebius* [w], *Epiphanius* [x], and *Jerom* [y], *Xyſtus*: which Word hath ſome Signification annexed to it in *Greek*; whereas *Sixtus* hath none either in *Greek* or *Latin*. He preſided Ten Years, according to *Euſebius* [z], but not

Year of Chriſt 119.

[o] Platin. in ej. vit. [p] Bar. ad ann. 132. N. 3. [q] Le Sueur, hiſt. de l'Egl. & de l'Emp. ad ann. 108. [r] Vid. Bolland. 3. Maii, p. 370. & Baillet vies de Saints, 3 de Maii. [s] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [t] Aug. ep. 53. [u] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [w] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 4. [x] Epiph. hær. 27. c. 6. [y] Hier. chron, [z] Euſeb. l. 3. c. 3.

not complete; for he was raised to the See in the Third Year of *Adrian*, of Christ 119, and died in the Twelfth Year of the same Prince, about the latter-end of the Year of Christ 128 [a]. He is ranked among the Martyrs in the Canon of the Mass, and in all the Martyrologies: but his immediate Successor is the first to whom that Title is given by *Irenæus*.

Decretals falsly ascribed to Sixtus.

To *Sixtus* are ascribed Two Decretals, but both forged in latter Ages, as plainly appeareth from *De Marca*, from *Baluzius*; and above all, from the haughty Title of *Universal Bishop*, which *Sixtus* is made to assume in one of them: a Title, as *F. Pagi* is forced to confess, unknown to the Bishops of the primitive and best Times [b]. The Title of *Universal* would be better adapted to the Reliques of this Pope, than to his Episcopacy; for they are dispersed all over the Roman Catholic World: but *Baillet* himself looks upon them as false, and unworthy of the Worship that is paid to them, not excepting even those that were given by *Clement* X. to Cardinal *De Retz*, who caused them to be placed with great Solemnity in the Abby of St. *Michael* in *Lorrain* [c].

His Reliquet.

ADRIAN, **TELESPHORUS,** ANTONINUS PIUS.

Seventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 128.

SIXTUS was succeeded by *Telesphorus* (or, as some style him, *Thelesphorus*), the Seventh Bishop of the See of *Rome* [d]. To him is ascribed, in some Editions of the Chronicle of *Eusebius*, the Institution of *Lent* [e]; but in none of the best Editions Mention is made of such an Institution, and scarce in any Manuscripts [f]. *Baronius* endeavours to prove, that

[a] Euseb. l. 4. c. 4 & 5. [b] Pagi in vit. Sixt. [c] Baill. ib. 6. d'Auril. [d] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. Euseb. l. 4, c. 5. [e] Bar. ad ann. 154. [f] Not. Scal. in chron. 216. Not. Pont. in chron. p. 612.

that this Faſt was inſtituted by the Apoſtles, and that *Teleſphorus* eſtabliſhed it for ever by a Decree; but his Arguments are ſo weak, that he deſerveth rather to be pitied than anſwered. He introduceth too early the Biſhops of *Rome* iſſuing Decrees, and preſcribing Laws to the whole Church. *Teleſphorus* was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome* who ſuffered Death for the Chriſtian Religion, ſeeing *Irenæus* diſtinguiſheth him with the Title of Martyr [g], which this Author giveth to none of his Predeceſſors; but as to the Particulars of his Death, the Antients have left us quite in the Dark. He ſuffered in the Eleventh Year of his Pontificate, the Firſt of *Antoninus Pius*, and 139 of Chriſt [h].

Teleſphorus *the firſt Biſhop of* Rome *Martyr.*

ANTONINUS PIUS. **HYGINUS,**

Eighth BISHOP *of* Rome.

HYGINUS, the Succeſſor of *Teleſphorus*, governed the Church but Four Years, and thoſe not complete; for, in 142, we find *Pius* already in that See [i]. In his Time the two famous Heretics, *Valentine* and *Cerdo*, came to *Rome*; the former from *Egypt*, and the latter from *Syria*, to diſplay their new Doctrine in that great Metropolis. *Hyginus* no doubt oppoſed them with all the Zeal of a primitive Biſhop; but, in ſpite of his Zeal, they gained a great many Proſelytes to their heterodox Opinions [k]. His Infallibility, had it been then known and believed, would have ſoon put a Stop to the growing Evil. The Church of *Rome* honours *Hyginus* among her Martyrs, but none of the Antients give him that Title. To him is aſcribed the Uſe of Godfathers and

Year of Chriſt 139.

The two Heretics, Valentine *and* Cerdo, *come to* Rome.

[g] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [h] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 10. [i] Idem, l. 4. c. 11.
[k] Iren. l. 3. c. 4. Philaſ. c. 44. Epiph. hær. 41. c. 1.

and Godmothers in Baptism, and the Ceremony of Consecrating Churches; but upon no better Grounds than the Two Decretals are fathered upon him, which are, by all the Learned, rejected as spurious. *Hyginus* died in the Year 142, the Fourth or Fifth of *Antoninus Pius*; and is supposed to have been buried near St. *Peter* [l].

ANTONINUS PIUS.

PIUS,

Ninth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 142.

ANICETUS is placed next to *Hyginus* by *Optatus* [m], St. *Augustin* [n], and *Epiphanius* [o]: But who would not, with *Eusebius* [p], rather follow *Irenæus* [q], and *Hegesippus* [r], naming *Pius* immediately after *Hyginus*, since the former wrote in the Time of *Eleutherius* the second Bishop after *Anicetus*; and the latter lived at *Rome* in the Time of *Anicetus*, and continued there till the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*?

Marcion comes to Rome.

In the Time of *Pius*, *Marcion*, a Native of *Pontus*, and the Son of a Bishop of the holy Catholic Church, says *Epiphanius* [t], being excommunicated by his Father for debauching a Virgin, and finding he could by no means prevail upon the venerable Prelate to receive him again into the Church, abandoned his native City, supposed to be *Sinope*, and fled to *Rome*. Upon his Arrival there, he applied to the Elders of that Church, intreating them to admit him to their Communion. But those holy Men, who had been taught by the Disciples of the Apostles, instead of complying with his Request, returned him this Answer; We cannot admit you without Leave from your holy Father; nor can we, as we are all united in

The Power of receiving Appeals disowned by the Church of Rome.

[l] Bolland. April. p. 22. [m] Opt. l. 2 p. 48. [n] Aug ep. 53. [o] Epiph, hær. 42 [p] Eusеb. l. 5. c. 24. [q] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [r] Apud Eusеb. l. 4. c. 22. [t] Epiph. hær. 42. c. 1.

in the ſame Faith, and the ſame Sentiments, undo what our holy Collegue your Father hath done.—— Thus *Epiphanius* [u]. Had *Bellarmine* lived in thoſe Days, he had taught them another Doctrine, a Doctrine which, however neceſſary, the Apoſtles had forgot to deliver to their Diſciples; *viz.* That the See of *Rome* was raiſed above all other Sees; that the Appeals of the whole Catholic Church were to be brought to it; that no Appeals were to be made from it; that it was to judge of the whole Church, but to be judged by none. *Marcion* did not apply to *Pius*, as the Reader muſt have obſerved, or at leaſt did not apply to him alone, but to the Elders, who diſclaimed all Power of reverſing the Sentence of a particular Biſhop or Judge. And is not this an evident and inconteſtable Proof, that the Power of receiving Appeals was not known, or thought of, in thoſe Days? And yet, who would believe it? *Bellarmine* hath the Aſſurance to allege this very Caſe as an Argument to prove in the Pope a Power of receiving Appeals [w]. But what would become of this Prerogative, ſhould the Pope return the ſame Anſwer to every Appellant?

Pius governed the Church for the Space of Fifteen Years, and died in 157, the Twentieth of *Antoninus* [x]. The *Roman* Martyrology tells us, that he was martyred in the Perſecution of *Antoninus Pius*; but in that Prince's Reign there was no Perſecution; nor is the Title of Martyr given him by *Irenæus*. *Baronius* aſcribeth to this Pope a Decree, commanding the Feſtival of *Eaſter* to be kept on *Sunday*, and quotes the Chronicle of *Euſebius* [y]. This Decree is indeed mentioned in ſome Editions of that Writer; but *Scaliger* aſſureth us, that no Mention is made of it in any Manuſcript Copy; and therefore he hath left it out in his Edition [z]. As to the Celebration of *Eaſter*,

Pius no Martyr.

Writings aſcribed to him.

[u] Idem ib. [w] Bell. l. 2. c. 21. [x] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 11. [y] Bar. ad ann. 159. [z] Euſeb. chron. not. Scal. p. 119.

Easter, it is manifest from *Irenæus*, that although *Pius*, as well as his Predecessors *Sixtus*, *Telesphorus*, and *Hyginus*, differed from the Bishops of *Asia*, yet they did not on that Account separate themselves from their Communion [a]. On this Pope are fathered several spurious Pieces, *viz.* some Decrees, Two Letters ranked among the Decretals, and Two more written to *Justus* Bishop of *Vienne* in *Dauphiné*. The Decrees, as well as the Decretals, are universally rejected; and yet *F. Pagi* quoteth one of them to prove the real Presence in the Sacrament [b]. The Two Letters to *Justus* are deemed genuine by *Baronius* [c], by Cardinal *Bona* [d], and by *Blondel* in his Treatise of the Sibyls [e], who nevertheless suspects them elsewhere [f]. On the other hand, they are absolutely rejected as false by Dr. *Pearson* [g], by *Cotelerius* [h], and *Natalis Alexander* [i], who discover several Expressions in them that were not in Use till some Ages after, and a great many Incoherences. To say with *Le Sueur*, That they were written originally in *Greek*, and in later Times translated into *Latin* [k], is but a poor Evasion. As for the Fable of *Hermes*, the Brother of *Pius*, who, by the Command of an Angel appearing to him in the Disguise of a Shepherd, is said to have wrote a Book, shewing, that *Easter* ought to be kept on *Sunday*, I refer the Reader to *Platina*, and such-like Writers.

[a] Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. [b] Pagi in Pio, n. 2. [c] Bar. ad ann. 166. [d] Bona rer. liturgic. l. 1. c. 3. [e] Blond. l. 2. c. 6. [f] Idem de la primauté. [g] Pearf. in Ign. l. 2. p. 170. [h] Cotel. not. in script. Apost. p. 42, 43. [i] Nat. Alex. t. 1. p. 89. [k] Sueur. hist. de l'Egl. &c. ad ann. 149.

ANICETUS,

ANTONINUS, **ANICETUS,** M. AURELIUS.

Tenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

PIUS was ſucceeded by *Anicetus*, in whoſe Time *Valentine* the Heretic, who came to *Rome* in the Pontificate of *Hyginus*, and had gained many Proſelytes under *Pius*, continued ſowing his peſtilential Errors among the Members of that Church: but many, whom he had ſeduced, were reclaimed by St. *Polycarp*, formerly the Diſciple of St. *John* the Evangeliſt, and then Biſhop of *Smyrna*. His declaring to them, that the Doctrine taught by the Church was the Doctrine he had learnt of the Apoſtles, made ſuch an Impreſſion on their Minds, that they abjured the Errors of *Valentine*, and returned to the Communion of the Faithful[l]. They preferred the bare Word of *Polycarp*, who claimed no Infallibility, to the infallible Authority of *Hyginus*, *Pius*, and *Anicetus*. This is a plain Proof, that the Popes had not yet begun to exert their Infallibility; or, if they had, that it was not acknowledged. What brought St. *Polycarp* to *Rome* was the Controverſy about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, which at this Time began to grow very warm between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches[m]. All the Churches of the Eaſt, and amongſt the reſt that of *Smyrna*, kept *Eaſter* on the 14th Day of the Moon of the firſt Month, in Conformity to the Cuſtom of the *Jews:* on the other hand, *Anicetus* would neither conform to that Cuſtom himſelf, nor ſuffer any under his Juriſdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that Solemnity on the *Sunday* next following the 14th of the Moon. That this Diſpute might not occaſion a Schiſm in the Church, *Polycarp* undertook

Year of Chriſt 157. *St.* Polycarp *cometh to* Rome, *and reclaimeth many from the Errors of* Marcion.

[l] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. & l. 1. c. 24. [m] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 13.

took a Journey to *Rome*, in order to confer with the Biſhop of that City, who was the chief Oppoſer of the *Quartodecimans* [n]. But it happened in this, as it doth in moſt religious Diſputes, they parted, each retaining his own Way of thinking; but at the ſame time, what happeneth but ſeldom, without the leaſt Breach of that Charity which is the great and fundamental Law of our holy Religion. In Token whereof they communicated together at the holy Sacrament; nay, *Anicetus*, out of Reſpect to St. *Polycarp*, yielded to him the *Euchariſt* [o]; that is, gave him leave to conſecrate the *Euchariſt* in his own Church: after which they parted in Peace, although both determined to follow the antient Practice of their reſpective Churches [p]. St. *Polycarp*, although well acquainted with the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, was a Stranger, it ſeems, to that of *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, &c. *viz.* that the whole Catholic Church is bound to conform to the Rites, Ceremonies, and Cuſtoms of the Church of *Rome*.

Anicetus and he diſagree about the Celebration of Eaſter, *but part without Breach of Charity.*

In the Time of *Anicetus*, *Hegeſippus*, and the celebrated Martyr St. *Juſtin*, came to *Rome*, upon what Occaſion is uncertain. The former, continuing there to the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*, wrote a Book on the Doctrine which to that Church had been conveyed down from the Apoſtles to *Anicetus*, and was ſtill obſerved, ſays he, in all its original Purity [q]. The latter oppoſed with great Zeal *Marcion* and his Followers, publiſhing a Book againſt his pernicious Tenets, and againſt Hereſies in general [r]. It was at *Rome* that he had frequent Conferences with *Creſcens* the *Cynic*, a Man of ſome Note at that Time; but, according to the Genius of his Sect, proud, ſurly, conceited, and a declared Enemy to all who profeſſed the Chriſtian Religion, which he painted in the blackeſt Colours [s]. The Malice of this *Cynic* procured

Hegeſippus and St. Juſtin *at* Rome.

[n] Iren. apud Euſeb. l. iv. c. 14.
[o] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 23, 24.
[p] Idem ib.
[q] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 11.
[r] Juſt. Apol. 2. p. 70.
[s] Tatian orat. cont. Græc. p. 160.

procured in the End for our zealous and learned Apologiſt what he had long and moſt ardently wiſhed, the Glory of ſealing with his Blood the Truth, which he had ſo ſtrenuouſly defended and promoted with his Pen[t]. He ſuffered under *Marcus Aurelius* and *L. Verus* about the Year 167, towards the End of the Pontificate of *Anicetus*.

To this Pope are aſcribed by *Anaſtaſius*, *Platina*, *Ciaconius*, and other modern Writers, ſeveral Ordinances and Decrees; but as they are not mentioned by any of the Antients, we do not think them worthy of our Notice. *Anicetus* governed the Church, according to *Euſebius*[u], Eleven Years, from the Year 157, to the 8th Year of *M. Aurelius*, that is, to 168, of the Chriſtian Æra. *Raban*, *Florus*, and *Anaſtaſius*, ſuppoſe him to have died for the Profeſſion of the Faith; which was, it ſeems, unknown to *Irenæus*. He was buried, according to ſome, near St. *Peter*, in the *Vatican*, according to others, in the Burying-place of *Calixtus*[w]; out of which, although it is uncertain whether he was buried there or no, his Head was taken in 1590, and given by *Urban* VII. to the *Jeſuits* of *Munich* in *Bavaria*, where it is yearly, with great Solemnity, expoſed to publick Adoration on the 17th of *April*, the Anniverſary, as is ſuppoſed, of his Death: his Body was taken out of the ſame Place in 1604, and given by *Clement* VIII. to the Duke of *Altaemps*, who cauſed it to be conveyed to the Chapel of his Palace in *Rome*, and to be depoſited there in a Marble Tomb, formerly the Tomb of the Emperor *Alexander*; where it is worſhipped to this Day.

Anicetus *not a Martyr.*

His Reliques.

[t] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 16. Epiph. hær. 46. c. 1. [u] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 19. [w] Vide Bolland. April. 17, & 22.

SOTER,

M. Aurelius.

SOTER,

Eleventh Bishop *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 168.

His Charities to the distressed Christians.

SOTER, the Successor of *Anicetus*, is highly commended on account of his extensive Charity towards the Poor of other Churches, but more especially towards those who were condemned, for the Confession of their Faith, to work in the Mines [x]. These he is said not only to have relieved in their Distress with generous Gatherings made for that Purpose at *Rome*, wherein he followed the Example of his Predecessors, but moreover to have sent Letters to them in their afflicted Condition. This we learn from a Letter of *Dionysius*, then Bishop of *Corinth*, which was an Answer to a Letter from *Soter*, and the Church of *Rome*. *Dionysius* returns Thanks to the *Romans*, and their Bishop, for their Generosity to the Poor of *Corinth*; acquaints *Soter* that his Letter had been publickly read; adds, that he shall cause it to be read for the future; and closeth his Epistle with great Encomiums on the *Romans*, who had so generously contributed to the Support of the indigent *Corinthians* [y]. This laudable Custom did not end with the Second Century of the Church; for *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, writing about the Year 254, to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, says, that all *Syria* and *Arabia* felt the good Effects of the Generosity of the *Romans* [z]. And some Years after, that is, about the Year 260, Pope *Dionysius* being informed that the City of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia* had been ruined by the Wars, and many Christians carried into Captivity, he sent large Sums to ransom them, with a Letter to the Church of *Cæsarea*, which was still read in St. *Basil*'s Time [a]. *Eusebius* tells us, that this Custom continued

[x] Euseb. l. 4. c. 23. [y] Idem ib. [z] Idem, l. 7. c. 5.
[a] Basil. ep. 220.

nued until the laſt Perſecution [b]. How differently the immenſe Revenues of the See of *Rome* are employed now, thoſe know who have ſeen the extravagant Pomp, Luxury, and Parade of that Court. In the Year 171, the Fourth of *Soter*, was broached the Hereſy of the *Montaniſts*, ſo called from their Ring-leader *Montanus* [c]. Againſt theſe *Soter* is ſaid, by an anonymous Writer of ſome Antiquity, to have compoſed a Book, which was anſwered, according to the ſame Writer, by *Tertullian*, become the Defender of that Sect [d]: but, according to the beſt Chronologiſts, *Tertullian* did not turn *Montaniſt* until many Years after the Death of *Soter*; and, beſides, both *Soter*'s Book, and *Tertullian*'s Anſwer to it, were quite unknown to *Euſebius*, and even to St. *Jerom*, who took great Delight in reading *Tertullian*. *Soter* preſided Eight Years, according to *Euſebius* [e]; that is, from the Year 168, to 176, or to the Beginning of 177, the 17th Year of the Reign of *M. Aurelius*. The Title of Martyr is given him by the modern Writers, but not by *Irenæus*, or any of the Antients. To him are falſly aſcribed Two Epiſtles, which have been placed among the Decretals. Where he was buried is uncertain; but his Body is worſhipped, at preſent, in the Church of St. *Sylveſter* at *Rome*, *and in the Cathedral of* Toledo *in* Spain [f].

The Hereſy of Montanus *broached in his Time.*

He did not die a Martyr.

M. Aurelius, ELEUTHERIUS, Commodus.

Twelfth Bishop *of* Rome.

ELEUTHERIUS was Deacon of the Church of *Rome* in 168, when *Hegeſippus* came to that City [a]; but *Soter*, the Succeſſor of *Anicetus*, being dead,

Year of Chriſt 176.

[b] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 23. [c] Euſeb. chron. [d] Auct. anonym. de hæreſ. a Sirmund. edit. hær. 26. 86. p. 28. 79. [e] Euſeb. l. 5. p 153. [f] Bar. in martyrol. 22 April. et Bollard. ad eund. diem. [a] Euſeb. l. 4. c. 22. Hier. vir. ill. c. 22.

dead, he was chosen to govern the Church in his room [b]. It is certain, that his Election was known in *Gaul* before the Death of the Martyrs of *Lions*, so famous in ecclesiastical History; for the Controversy, which had been raised some Years before in the Churches of *Asia*, by *Montanus* and his Followers, concerning the prophetic Spirit, to which they pretended, making at that time a great Noise in the Church, the Martyrs of *Lions*, desirous to contribute, so far as in them lay, to the publick Peace, wrote Letters, from their Prisons, to the Churches of *Asia*, and likewise to *Eleutherius*, Bishop of *Rome*, declareing their Judgment and Opinion in the Case [c]: for great Honour was paid, in those Times, to the Martyrs, and their Opinion was always received with Esteem and Veneration. It were much to be wished, that *Eusebius* had set down their Opinion at Length; but he contents himself only with saying, that it was entirely agreeable to true Piety, and to the orthodox Faith [d]; which, in my Opinion, is enough to make us reject the Notion of Dr. *Pearson*, who taketh it for granted, that they wrote in Favour of those Fanatics, and that for no other Reason but because they are said, by *Eusebius*, to have wrote for the Peace of the Church [e]. Was the admitting of false Prophets, and false Prophecies, giving Peace to the Church? The same Writer adds, that *Eleutherius* was induced, by the Reverence and Regard he had for the holy Martyrs, to receive the Prophecies of *Montanus*, and his Two Propheteſſes [f]. But herein I must beg Leave to disagree with that learned Writer, and likewise with Dr. *Cave* [g]; for it was not, in my Opinion, *Eleutherius*, but his Successor *Victor*, who received the Prophecies of *Montanus*. *Tertullian*, the only Author who informeth us, that the Dreams of that Enthusiast were approved by the Bishop

The Martyrs of Lions *write to* Eleutherius.

Eleutherius *did not approve the Prophecies of* Montanus.

[b] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. [c] Euseb. l. 3. c. 3. [d] Euseb. ib. [e] Pearſ. post. p. 255. [f] Idem ib. [g] Cave's Lives of the Fathers, p. 164.

Biſhop of *Rome*, doth not diſtinguiſh that Biſhop by his Name; ſo that he is to be found out only by Reaſoning and Chronology. Now, on one hand, we read in *Tertullian*, that *Montanus* had been oppoſed by *the Predeceſſors* of the Biſhop, who embraced his Opinions [h]; and, on the other, in *Euſebius* [i], that the Hereſy of *Montanus* was firſt broached in the Year 171. the Eleventh of the Reign of M. *Aurelius*, and the Fourth of the Pontificate of *Soter*, the immediate Predeceſſor of *Eleutherius*; theſe Two therefore, and theſe alone, were the Biſhops, who could oppoſe *Montanus*; and, ſince the firſt Broaching of that Hereſy, the only Predeceſſors of the Biſhop who embraced it. *Victor*, the Succeſſor of *Eleutherius*, was greatly provoked againſt the *Aſiatic* Biſhops, on account of their refuſing to comply with the Cuſtom of the Church of *Rome*, in the Celebration of *Eaſter*; and therefore might, out of Spite to them, approve of the Opinions which they had condemned: for *Montanus*, and his Followers, had been already condemned, as *Euſebius* informeth us [k], by ſeveral Synods held in *Aſia Minor*. No Opinion is now deemed heretical, unleſs condemned by the Biſhop of *Rome*, who claims that Prerogative as peculiar to himſelf; but the Synods of *Aſia*, the firſt mentioned in Hiſtory, after that of the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem*, condemned the Opinions of *Montanus*, and cut him off from their Communion, without conſulting, or even acquainting therewith, the Biſhop of *Rome*. But, to return to the Martyrs; ſome are of Opinion, that they condemned, in their Letters, the Tenets of *Montanus*, and his Followers; but, at the ſame time, wrote in their Favour, ſo far as to intreat the Biſhops of *Aſia*, and *Eleutherius* Biſhop of *Rome*, to treat them with Indulgence, and admit them,

Councils held without conſulting the Biſhop of Rome.

[h] Tert. in Prax. c. 1. [i] Euſeb. in chron. [k] Idem, l. 5. c. 16. Con. per Labb. t. 1. p. 599.

them, upon Repentance, to their Communion [l]. This is but a bare Conjecture, not authorized by any of the Antients; and we do not find, that the *Montaniſts* ever ſhewed the leaſt Inclination to return to the Communion of the Church.

Florinus and Blaſtus broach their new Doctrine.

It was in the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*, that *Florinus* and *Blaſtus* firſt broached their new Doctrine; which was readily embraced by many at *Rome*; for they were both Preſbyters of that Church [m]. *Florinus* was firſt one of the Emperor's Officers in *Aſia*, afterwards the Diſciple of St. *Polycarp*, then famous all over that Province; and, laſtly, Preſbyter of the Church of *Rome*; but both he and *Blaſtus* were degraded on account of their heretical Opinions, and cut off from the Communion of the Faithful [n]. Againſt *Florinus*, *Irenæus*, then Biſhop of *Lions*, wrote a Letter, intituled, *Of Monarchy, or that God is not the Author of Evil* [o]; and another Piece called, *De Ogdoede*, that is, *of the Eight*; meaning, perhaps, the Eight *Eons*, or Perſons that compoſed the chimerical Divinity of the *Valentinians*; for *Florinus* fell at laſt into that Hereſy [p]. Againſt *Blaſtus*, whom *Pacian* ſurnames the *Greek* [q], *Irenæus* wrote a Book, intituled, *Of Schiſm* [r]. *Ado* [s] and *Bede* [t] tell us, that *Eleutherius* iſſued a Decree, ordaining *Eaſter* to be kept on the *Sunday* after the 14th of the firſt Moon; but as no mention is made of ſuch a Decree, by any Writer of thoſe Times, their Authority is of no Weight.

The Converſion of Lucius, a Britiſh King.

Lucius, a *Britiſh* King, is ſaid, by *Bede*, to have wrote to Pope *Eleutherius*, intreating him to ſend a proper Perſon into *Britain*, to inſtruct him in the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion; which the Pope readily granted [u]. But as this is vouched only by *Bede*,

[l] Vide Dupin. Biblioth. p. 287. [m] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 14. [n] Idem ib. c. 15. 20. [o] Idem ib. [p] Fleuri. hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 26. 27. p. 395, 397. [q] Pacian. ep. 1. [r] Euſeb. ib. c. 20. [s] Ado ad ann. 194. [t] Bed. chron. t. 2. p. 111. [u] Bed. hiſt. l. 1. c. 4. et chron. t. 2. p. 111.

Bede, who lived many Ages after him, and by a Pontifical, ſuppoſed to have been written about the Middle of the Sixth Century, what Credit the whole Hiſtory of *Lucius* may deſerve, I leave the Reader to judge. Such a remarkable Event could not have eſcaped *Euſebius*, who, ſpeaking of this very Period of Time, tells us, that, at *Rome*, many Perſons, eminent for their Birth and Wealth, embraced the Chriſtian Religion, with their whole Families [w]. A ſolemn Embaſſy from a *Britiſh* King, and his Converſion, ſurely deſerved a Place in the Hiſtory of the Church. He informeth us, that, in the Reign of *Commodus*, and the Pontificate of *Eleutherius*, the Chriſtian Religion enjoyed a profound Tranquillity all over the World; that it flouriſhed, and attracted, to uſe his Expreſſion, the Minds of many People [x]. Had he not here a favourable Opportunity of mentioning our Royal Proſelyte, who, in the Reign of *Commodus*, is ſuppoſed to have wrote to *Eleutherius*, and by his means to have been converted to the Chriſtian Religion? To what can we aſcribe the Silence of ſuch an exact and accurate Writer, concerning an Event which would have greatly recommended both his Hiſtory, and the Chriſtian Religion? To an invincible Antipathy, ſays the Jeſuit *Alford* [y], which he bore to the Name of *Britain*, and which was ſo prevalent in him, that he choſe rather to ſuppreſs the Converſion of *Lucius*, than mention it. But what could thus ſet *Euſebius* againſt *Britain?* Had he been ever injured by the *Britons?* Doth he not elſewhere mention both them and their Country? This jeſuitical, abſurd, and groundleſs Speculation, which muſt expoſe the Author of it to the Ridicule of every Reader, I ſhould perhaps have let paſs unobſerved, had he not in this very Place inſulted, beyond the Bounds of common Decency, the Reformers of Religion,

The whole Account fabulous

[w] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 21 [x] Idem ib. [y] Annal. ad ann. 182. p. 140.

ligion, for rejecting ſome idle Ceremonies, which he ſuppoſeth to have been practiſed at the Converſion of *Lucius*. But, not to lay the whole Streſs on the Silence of *Euſebius*, and other antient Writers, to whom King *Lucius* was utterly unknown, why ſhould he have been at the Trouble of ſending to *Rome* for an Inſtructor? Were there not many in his own Kingdom as capable of inſtructing him as any *Rome* could ſend? The Chriſtian Religion had been planted in this Iſland long before the Reign of *Lucius*, in the Time of the Apoſtles, as *Gildas* ſeemeth to inſinuate [z], at leaſt very early in the Second Century; for *Origen*, who flouriſhed in the Beginning of the Third, tells us, that the Virtue of the Name of *Jeſus* had paſſed the Seas, to find out the *Britons* in another World [a].

Several monkiſh Fables concerning King Lucius.

The ſhort Account, which *Bede* giveth us of the Embaſſy and Converſion of King *Lucius*, hath not only been greedily ſwallowed by the monkiſh Writers, who came after him, but had ſerved as a Ground-plot to the innumerable Fables with which they have filled this Part of their Hiſtories. They even tell us the Names of the Embaſſadors ſent by *Lucius* to the Pope, and of the Legates *a Latere* ſent by the Pope to *Lucius*. The former were *Elvanus* and *Medwinus*, who, being ordained Biſhops by *Eleutherius*, returned to *Britain*, and greatly contributed to the Converſion of this Iſland. Theſe Fables gained Credit, by Degrees, in thoſe Ages of Ignorance and Superſtition, inſomuch that the Two Embaſſadors were, at laſt, ranked among the Saints; and their Bodies, where or when found, nobody knoweth, expoſed to publick Veneration, in the Monaſtery of *Glaſſenbury*, on the Firſt of *January* [b]. The Pope's Legates were *Fugacius* and *Damianus*, who, as we are told, went back to *Rome*, to obtain of *Eleutherius* a Confirmation

[z] Gild ex, c. 6. p. 116. [a] Orig. in Luc. hom. 6. [b] Vide Uſh. Brit. eccleſ. antiq. c. 4, et Bolland 1. Jan.

tion of what they had done; and, from *Rome*, returned into *Britain*, with a Letter from the Pope to King *Lucius*[c]. As for the King himſelf, he is ſaid to have quitted his Kingdom, and, turning Miſſionary, to have preached the Goſpel in *Germany*, eſpecially at *Auſburg*; to have travelled from thence into the Country of the *Griſons*; and, laſtly, to have been ordained Biſhop of *Coire*, their Metropolis; and to have died there a Martyr[d]. To theſe monkiſh Fables King *Lucius* oweth a Place among the Saints; for on the Third of *December* is kept, in the Church of *Rome*, *the Feſtival of* Lucius, *King of the* Britons, *who died at* Coire *in* Germany[e]; theſe are the Words of the *Roman* Martyrology; but *Bede* doth not ſo much as mention him in his; a plain Proof, that what is ſaid of his Preaching, of his Martyrdom, *&c.* was invented after that Writer's Time. And yet *Alford* hath not only filled his Annals with theſe, and ſuch-like fabulous Accounts, giving an intire Credit to them, but inveigheth, with great Acrimony, againſt thoſe who have not the Gift of Belief in the ſame Degree with himſelf, eſpecially againſt *Dempſter*, telling him, that till his Time the Converſion of *Lucius* had never been queſtioned by any Man of Senſe or Learning[f]. And truly, the Story of King *Lucius* hath been credited even by the greater Part of Proteſtant Writers, out of Reſpect to our venerable Hiſtorian; but as he wrote many Ages after the pretended Converſion of that Prince, and none of the Writers of thoſe Days, whom ſuch a remarkable Event could hardly have eſcaped, give us the leaſt Hint of it, we may be well allowed to queſtion the Whole, notwithſtanding the Authority of *Bede*, which can be of no Weight with reſpect to Tranſactions

[c] Bar. ad ann. 183. Bolland 26 Maii. Uſh. ib. p. 54. 102.
[d] Vide Uſh. ib. p. 137, 138. [e] Martyr. Rom. 3. Decem.
[f] Alf ad ann. 201. p. 201.

actions that are said to have happened in Times so remote.

Eleutherius governed, according to the best Chronologers, Fifteen Years; and died in 192. the last of the Emperor *Commodus* [g]. To him are ascribed a Decretal, addressed to the Bishops of *Gaul*, and a Decree, declaring against *Montanus*, and his Followers, that no Food was forbidden to the Christians; but both are deemed spurious. He was buried, according to some, in the *Salarian* Way, according to others, in the *Vatican*; but, in what Place soever he was buried, his Body is now worshipped in the *Vatican* at *Rome*, in the Cathedral of *Troia* in *Apulia*, and in several other Places [h]. The Title of Martyr is given him by the Church of *Rome*, but not by any of the antient Writers. Under him flourished *Hegesippus*, who wrote, in Five Books, an Account of what had happened in the Church since our Saviour's Death, to his Time [i]. He came to *Rome* in the Pontificate of *Anicetus*, who was chosen in 157. and, remaining there to the Time of *Eleutherius*, who succeeded *Anicetus* and *Soter* in 177. he wrote a Book on the Doctrine received by Tradition in that Church [k]; but neither of these Works hath reached our Times.

Commodus, Pertinax, **VICTOR,** Severus.

Thirteenth Bishop *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 192. *VICTOR*, the Successor of *Eleutherius*, is counted by a Writer, who, at this very Time, lived in *Rome*, the Thirteenth Bishop of that City [l]: so that neither is St. *Peter* reckoned among them, nor is

[g] Euseb chron. Florent, p. 811. [h] Bolland. 26 Maii, p. 364.
[i] Hier. vir. ill. c. 22. [k] Idem ib. et. Euseb. l. 4. c. 11, 22.
[l] Vide Euseb. l. 5. c. 28.

is *Cletus* distinguished from *Anacletus*. In *Victor*'s Time a new Heresy was broached, at *Rome*, by one *Theodotus* of *Byzantium*, denying the Divinity of *Christ* [m]. The *Theodotians* gave out, that *Victor* favoured their Doctrine [n]; which he did, perhaps, at that Time [o]; although he cut them off afterwards from his Communion. Be that as it will, he can by no means be cleared from another Imputation, namely, that of owning and approving the prophetic Spirit of *Montanus*, and his Two Propheteſſes, *Priſca* and *Maximilla:* for *Tertullian*, his Cotemporary, telleth us, in expreſs Terms, that he received their Prophecies; that, upon receiving them, he gave Letters of Peace to the Churches of *Aſia* and *Phrygia*; but that one *Praxeas*, juſt come from thoſe Parts, giving him a falſe Account of thoſe Prophets, and their Churches, and remonſtrating that, by approving them, he condemned his Predeceſſors, prevailed upon him to revoke the Letters, which he had already wrote in their Behalf. Thus *Tertullian* became himſelf a Follower of *Montanus* [p]. Here *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, the Two great Advocates for the Pope's Infallibility, are put to a Stand: they own, and cannot help owning, that the Pope was deceived, and impoſed upon; but, for all that, will not give up his Infallibility. How great is the Power of Prejudice and Prepoſſeſſion! They find the Pope actually erring, and yet maintain, that he cannot err. But this Apoſtaſy from common Senſe, if I may be allowed the Expreſſion, is not, perhaps, ſo much owing to Prejudice, as to ſomething worſe; for no Prejudice, however prevalent, can withſtand the indiſputable Evidence of plain Matters of Fact. It is no new thing, ſays *Baronius*, nor what ought to cauſe in us the leaſt Surprize, that a Pope ſhould be over-reached by Impoſtors [q]. A Pope over-reached in Matters

The Hereſy of Theodotus.

Victor *approves the prophetic Spirit of* Montanus.

His Infallibility, *how defended by* Baronius *and* Bellarmine.

[m] Epiph. hær. 54. c. 1. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. [n] Euſeb. ib.
[o] Idem ib. [p] Tert. in Prax. c. 1. [q] Bar. ad. ann. 173. n. 4.

Matters of Faith! What then becometh of Infallibility? or what is the Use of it? But the *Montanists*, says *Bellarmine*[r], craftily concealed from the Pope what was erroneous and heretical in their Prophecies; so that he, discovering nothing in their Doctrine repugnant to that of the Church, believed they had been unjustly accused to, and condemned by, his Predecessors. But, in the first Place, *Tertullian* telleth us, in express Terms, that the Prophecies of *Montanus*, and his Followers, were approved by the Pope; whereas the Prophecies, which he is supposed by *Bellarmine* to have approved, were not the Prophecies of *Montanus*, but others, quite different, and in every respect orthodox. In the second Place, if *Victor* believed, that the *Montanists* had been unjustly condemned by his Predecessors, he did not believe them infallible; so that, in every Light, this Fact oversets the pretended Infallibility. We may add, that, if the Pope's Infallibility, dependeth upon a right Information, and neither he nor we can know whether he hath been rightly informed, his Infallibility is thereby rendered quite useless; since, in every particular Case, we may doubt, and that Doubt cannot be removed, whether the Information, upon which he acteth, was right, or no.

The famous Controversy about the Celebration of Easter.

But what most of all distinguished the Pontificate of *Victor* was, the famous Controversy about the Celebration of *Easter*, between the Eastern and Western Bishops; the former keeping that Solemnity on the 14th Day of the first Moon, on what Day soever of the Week it happened to fall; and the latter putting it off until the *Sunday* following. This, surely, could not be a Point of any Consequence, since the Apostles had not thought fit to settle any thing concerning it; nay, by observing the Paschal Solemnity themselves, some on the one Day, and some on the other, as it is

[r] Bell. de sum. Pont. l. 4. c. 8.

is manifeſt they did [r], they plainly declared, that it was quite indifferent on what Day it was obſerved. Accordingly from the Apoſtles Time to *Victor*'s, each Church had followed the Cuſtom and Practiſe eſtabliſhed by their reſpective Founders, without giving the leaſt Diſturbance to others, or being, on that Account, diſturbed by them [t]. Pope *Anicetus* even ſuffered ſuch of the *Aſiatics* as happened to be at *Rome* to celebrate *Eaſter* after the manner of *Aſia* [u]: *Soter*, indeed, and his Succeſſor *Eleutherius*, obliged thoſe who lived at *Rome* to conform to the Cuſtom of that Church; but that did not prevent their ſending the *Euchariſt*, or Sacrament to the Biſhops, who followed the oppoſite Practiſe [w]; for a Cuſtom then obtained among Biſhops to ſend the *Euchariſt* to each other, eſpecially at *Eaſter*, in Token of Communion and Peace; but this Cuſtom was ſuppreſſed by the 14th Cannon of the Council held, in the Fourth Century at *Laodicea* [x]. *Victor*, not ſatisfied with what his two immediate Predeceſſors had done, took upon him to impoſe the *Roman* Cuſtom on all the Churches that followed the contrary Practice. But, in this bold Attempt, which we may call the firſt Eſſay of Papal Uſurpation, he met with a vigorous and truly Chriſtian Oppoſition from *Polycrates*, at that Time Biſhop of *Epheſus*, and one of the moſt eminent Men in the Church, both for Piety and Learning. He had ſtudied, ſays *Euſebius* [y], the Scriptures with great Attention, had conferred with Chriſtians from all Parts of the World, and had ever conformed his Life to the Rules of the Goſpel. *Jerom* ſpeaketh of him as a Man of excellent Parts, and one univerſally reſpected [z]. In the preſent Controverſy, he peremptorily refuſed to relinquiſh the Practice of his own Church, which had been firſt introduced

Victor's haughty Conduct.

Is oppoſed by the Biſhop of Epheſus.

[r] Euſeb. l. 5, c. 23, 25. Socrat. l. 5. c. 21. Epiph. hær. 70. c. 10. [t] Euſeb. l. 5. 24. [u] Idem ib. [w] Idem ib. c. 20. [x] Concil. per Labb. t. 1. p. 150. [y] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 22. et 24. [z] Hier. vir. ill. c. 45.

introduced by the Apoſtles St. *John* and St. *Philip*, and had been handed down to him by ſeven Biſhops of his own Family [a]. Hereupon *Victor*, impatient of Contradiction, wrote a Letter, threatning to cut him off from his Communion, unleſs he forthwith complied with the Practice of the Church of *Rome* [b]. *Polycrates*, greatly ſurprized at the haſty Proceedings of his Fellow-Biſhop, aſſembled in *Epheſus*, a Council of all the Biſhops of *Aſia minor*, when it was unanimouſly reſolved, that the Practice, which they had received from their Predeceſſors, ought not to be changed [c]. Agreeably to this Reſolution, *Polycrates* wrote to *Victor*, acquainting him therewith; and, at the ſame time, modeſtly inſinuating, that, as to his Menaces, he had better forbear them, ſince they had no manner of Effect upon him, or his Brethren [d]. Upon the Receipt of this Letter, *Victor*, giving the Reins to an impotent and ungovernable Paſſion, publiſhed bitter Invectives againſt all the Churches of *Aſia*, declared them cut off from his Communion, ſent Letters of Excommunication to their reſpective Biſhops; and, at the ſame time, in order to have them cut off from the Communion of the whole Church, wrote to the other Biſhops, exhorting them to follow his Example, and forbear communicating with their refractory Brethren of *Aſia* [e]. They all complied, to be ſure, with the Deſire of the Head of the Church, who had Power to command; but, out of his great Moderation, choſe to exhort and adviſe! No; not one followed his Example, or Advice; not one paid any ſort of Regard to his Letters, or ſhewed the leaſt Inclination to ſecond him in ſuch a raſh and uncharitable Attempt; but, on the contrary, they all joined, as *Euſebius* aſſureth us [f], in ſharply cenſuring and rebuking him, as a Diſturber of the Peace of the Church. Among the reſt,

And by a Council of all the Biſhops of Aſia minor.

He cuts them off from his Communion.

No Regard had to his Excommunication.

[a] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 24. [b] Idem ib. [c] Idem ib. [d] Idem ib. Hier. vir. ill. 45. [e] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 24. Socrat. l. 5. c. 22. [f] Euſeb. ib.

reſt, *Irenæus*, then Biſhop of *Lions*, wrote him an excellent Letter, putting him in mind of the Moderation of his Predeceſſors, and telling him that although he agreed with him in the Main of the Controverſy, yet he could not approve of his cutting off whole Churches, for the Obſervance of Cuſtoms, which they had received from their Anceſtors. He wrote at the ſame time, to many other Biſhops [g], no doubt, to diſſuade them from joining the Biſhop of *Rome*. However that be, it is certain, that, by this means, the Storm was laid, a Calm was reſtored to the Church, and the *Aſiatics* allowed to follow undiſturbed their antient Practice [h]. But Pope *Victor*, ſays *Baronius* [i], excommunicated the *Aſiatics*, which he would never have ventured to do, had he not known, that he had Power and Juriſdiction over them. The Argument may be thus retorted againſt him: The *Aſiatics* made no Account of his Excommunication; which they would not have ventured to do, had they not known, that he had no Power nor Juriſdiction over them. Beſides, *Victor* did not excommunicate them, as that Word is now underſtood; that is, he did not cut them off from the Communion of the Catholic Church; for all the other Biſhops continued to communicate with them as they had done before; he only ſeparated himſelf from their Communion, which was no more than every Biſhop had Power to do. *Victor* being thus baffled in his Attempt, his Succeſſors took care not to revive the Controverſy; ſo that the *Aſiatics* peaceably followed their antient Practice till the Council of *Nice*, which, out of Complaiſance to *Conſtantine the Great*, ordered the Solemnity of *Eaſter* to be kept every-where on the ſame Day, after the Cuſtom of *Rome* [k].

He is cenſured by Irenæus.

Had no Power over the Aſiatics.

This

[g] Euſeb. ib. et Socrat. l. 5. c. 22. [h] Euſeb ib. Hier. vir. ill. c. 35. Phot. c. 120. Cypr. ep. 74 Anat. p. 445. [i] Bar. ad ann. 198. n. 10. [k] Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 3. c. 18. Soz. l. 1. c. 16. Concil. l. 3. c. 18. 19. p. 492.

This Dispute happened, not in the Reign of *Commodus*, as we read in the *Synodicon*[l], but, in the Fourth Year of the Reign of *Severus*, as St. *Jerom* informeth us[m], of Christ 196. *Victor*, of whom we find nothing else in the Antients worthy of notice, died five Years after[n], that is, in the Ninth of the Emperor *Severus*, and in the End of 201, or the Beginning of 202, of Christ, having governed the Church ten Years. He is named by St. *Jerom*, the first among the Ecclesiastical Authors that wrote in Latin[o]. He published a piece, on the Controversy about the Celebration of *Easter*, and some other Books on religious Subjects, which were still extant in St. *Jerom*'s Time[p]. As for the two Decretals that are ascribed to him, and the two Letters to *Desiderius* and *Paracoda*, both Bishops of *Vienne*, they are universally rejected[q]. The Church of *Rome* hath placed *Victor* among her Saints; and truly, his Attempt, however unsuccessful, to promote the Power, and extend the Jurisdiction, of that See, deserved no less a Reward.

Victor dies.

His Works.

Pieces falsly ascribed to him.

He is sainted.

SEVERUS, CARACALLA, GETA,

ZEPHYRINUS;

MACRINUS. DIADUMENUS, HELIOGABALUS.

Fourteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 219.

IN the first Year of the Pontificate of *Zephyrinus*, who succeeded *Victor*, a dreadful Persecution was raised against the Christians by the Emperor *Severus*, and carried on with great Cruelty in all Parts of the Empire. *Zephyrinus*, however, had the good Luck to escape it, and to see the Church, by the Death of that Prince, happily delivered from the Evils, which the Rage of her foreign Enemies had brought upon her.

A dreadful Persecution against the Christians.

[l] Concil. Labb. t, 1. p. 601. [m] Hier. vir. ill. c. 43. et chron. [n] Euseb. l. 5. c. 28. Hier. Chron. [o] Hier. de vir. ill. c. 34. 40, [p] Idem ib. [q] Pearf. posth. p. 91, 92. Bosquet. l. 3. c. 5.

her. But her domeſtic Enemies gave her no Reſpite; the *Theodotian* Heretics continued ſowing, and not without Succeſs, their peſtilential Errors at *Rome*. *Zephyrinus*, it ſeemeth, oppoſed them with great Vigour and Zeal; for they reproached him, as we read in *Euſebius* [a], as the firſt who had betrayed the Truth, by maintaining againſt them the Divinity of *Chriſt*: hence he is ranked, by *Optatus*, with *Tertullian*, *Victorinus*, &c. among thoſe who have ſucceſsfully defended the Catholic Church [b]. *Baronius*, to extol *Zephyrinus*, aſcribeth to him the firſt Condemnation of *Praxeas* [c], which was followed by a ſolemn Retractation, under his own Hand. But it was in *Africa*, and not at *Rome*, that *Praxeas* was condemned, as appeared plain to me, from the Words of *Tertullian* [d], before I had ſeen either *Pamelius* or *Moreau*, who underſtand them in that Senſe. *Praxeas*, as we have obſerved, had done an eminent Piece of Service to the Church of *Rome*, by reclaiming Pope *Victor* from the Hereſy of *Montanus*: but the Good he had done on that Occaſion was over-balanced by the Miſchief his new Hereſy occaſioned both at *Rome* and in *Africa*; for in both Places he gained many Proſelytes. He denied all Diſtinction of Perſons in the Godhead, ſo that the Father being, according to his Doctrine, the ſame Perſon with the Son, it was he who took upon him human Nature, and ſuffered on the Croſs; whence his Followers were called *Patropaſſians* [e].

Zephyrinus oppoſes the Theodotian Heretics.

The Hereſy of Praxeas.

In the Pontificate of *Zephyrinus*, and, as *Euſebius* ſeemeth to inſinuate, in the beginning of the Reign of *Caracalla*, that is, towards the Year 211, or 212, came to *Rome* the celebrated *Origen*, being deſirous, as he himſelf declared, to ſee that Church, ſo venerable for its Antiquity and Renown; but after a very ſhort Stay there, he returned to *Alexandria* [f].

Origen at Rome.

About

[a] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. [b] Opt. l. 1. c. 37. [c] Bar. ad ann. 196. n. 209. [d] Tert. in Prax. c. 1. p. 634. [e] Caten Græc. Patr. c. 53. [f] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 14.

Famous Dispute at Rome, *between* Caius *and* Proclus.

About the same time happened, at *Rome*, the famous Dispute between *Caius*, a Presbyter of that Church, and *Proclus*, a leading Man among the *Montanists* [g]. *Caius* committed to Writing the Reasons and Arguments on both Sides [h]: but that Piece hath not reached our Times, although it was well known to *Eusebius*, who styleth it a Dialogue [i], and likewise to *Theodoret* [k].

Tertullian falls off from the Church.

It was during the Pontificate of *Zephyrinus*, that *Tertullian*, the great Defender of the Christian Religion, fell off from the Catholic Church. His Fall, which was lamented by all the Faithful as a common Loss, is ascribed by St. *Jerom*, to the Envy and ill Usage he met with from the *Roman* Clergy [l]. But how ill soever he was used by them in those Days, he hath perhaps met with worse Treatment at their Hands in later Times; for they call upon him as an Evidence to witness the Pope's universal Jurisdiction, and to confirm to him the haughty Titles, which he assumeth; but with how little Reason, will appear from the following Relation: A Catholic Bishop had, by a public Declaration, admitted Persons guilty of Adultery and Fornication to a Place among the Penitents. As *Tertullian* was a strict Observer of Rites and Discipline, and a most zealous Asserter of the greatest Rigours of Religion, he could not brook so much Moderation and Indulgence; and therefore, in his Book *De Pudicitia*, which he wrote on that Occasion, he extols the Severity of the antient Discipline, aggravates the Greatness of those Offences, undertakes to confute the Arguments for Remission and Indulgence; and speaking of the above-mentioned Declaration, he calleth it *a peremptory Decree*, and styles the Bishop who made it, *high Pontiff*, and *Bishop of Bishops* [m]. Hence the Advocates for the See of *Rome* infer, that, even in those early

The Titles of High Pontiff, *&c. whether and in what Sense, given by* Tertullian *to the Bishop of* Rome.

[g] Euseb. l. 6. c. 14. Hier. vir. ill. c. 59. [h] Idem ib. c. 20. [i] Idem. l. 3. c. 31. [k] Theod. hæret. fab. l. 3, c. 2. [l] Hier. vir. ill. c. 35. [m] Tert. de Pudic. c. 1.

early Times, ſuch Titles were given to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and that his Decrees were even then deemed peremptory[n]. But, in the firſt Place, it is uncertain, whether that Declaration was publiſhed by the Biſhop of *Rome*, or by ſome other great Biſhop, perhaps of *Carthage*, of *Alexandria*, or *Antioch*; for no Biſhop is named by *Tertullian*. In the ſecond Place, it is evident from the Context, that in the above-mentioned Paſſage *Tertullian* ſpeaketh ironically; and conſequently all that can be inferred from thence is, that he gave thoſe Titles to the Catholic Biſhop, whoever he was, by way of Deriſion; or if the Biſhop had aſſumed them in his Declaration, he took from thence Occaſion to expoſe his Vanity and Ambition. *Baronius*, and the Flatterers of the Biſhops of *Rome* triumph in this Paſſage of *Tertullian*; from which however, nothing can be inferred in Favour of that See, unleſs they prove, which they can never do, that the above-mentioned Declaration or Decree was publiſhed by the Biſhop of *Rome*; that thoſe Titles which raiſe him above other Biſhops, were Part of the Decree; and laſtly, that *Tertullian* mentioned them, as due to him, and not by way of Sarcaſm, ironically reflecting on his Pride and Ambition.

As to the Actions of *Zephyrinus*, the Antients have left us quite in the Dark; and we cannot depend on what we read in the modern Writers. He governed about Seventeen Years, and died in the firſt Year of *Heliogabalus*, and 218 of the Chriſtian Æra [o]. In the *Roman* Martyrology he hath a Place among the Martyrs, which putteth *Baronius* himſelf to a Stand [p]. ſince the Church enjoyed a profound Tranquillity from the Death of *Severus* to the End of his Pontificate.

Zephyrinus not a Martyr.

[n] Bar. ad ann. 216. n. 5, 6, &c. [o] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 21. & chron. [p] Bar. ad ann. 221. n. 1, 2.

CAL-

HELIOGABALUS CALLISTUS, ALEXAND. SEVERUS.

Fifteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 219.

ZEphyrinus was ſucceeded by *Calliſtus*, or *Callixtus*, as he is ſtyled by *Optatus* [a], and St. *Auſtin* [b]. In his Time the Church enjoyed a long, happy, and uninterrupted Peace, as *Tertullian* calleth it [c], which laſted from the Death of *Severus* in 211, to the Reign of *Maximinus* in 235, as did alſo the State from the Death of *Macrinus* in 218, to the Year 233. *Alexander*, who ſucceeded *Heliogabalus* in 222, proved extremely favourable to the Chriſtians, and even allowed them, if I miſtake not the Meaning of a profane Writer, the free Exerciſe of their Religion [d]: it is at leaſt certain, that he adjudged to them, againſt the Tavern-keepers, a Piece of Ground, which it is pretended they had uſurped upon the Public, ſaying, when he gave Sentence in their Favour, that it was better God ſhould be ſerved on it in any Manner, than that it ſhould be occupied by Tavern-keepers [e]; which was giving them Leave to ſerve God on it after their own Manner. On this Spot of Ground, *Baronius* ſuppoſeth *Calliſtus* to have built a Church in Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, known at preſent by the Name of *Santa Maria in Traſtevere*, that is, *Saint Mary beyond the Tiber* [f]. But the Pontifical of *Damaſus*, upon which alone he foundeth his Opinion, deſerveth no Credit, as I ſhall ſhew in the Life of that Pope. *Calliſtus* is ſaid by *Anaſtaſius* [g] to have incloſed a large Piece of Ground on the *Appian* Way, to ſerve as a Burying-place for the Chriſtians. This Ground is frequently mentioned in the Martyrologies, and deſcribed at length by *Arringhus*,

The Emperor Alexander *favourable to the Chriſtians.*

Calliſtus's *Burying-place.*

[a] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [b] Aug. ep. 53. [c] Tert. de cor. mil. [d] Lamprit in vit. Alex. p. 121. Idem ib. p. 131. [f] Bar. ad ann. 224. n. 4, 5. [g] Anaſt. in vit. Call.

Arringhus, who telleth us, that 174000 Martyrs, and 46 Popes were buried in it [h]. Although *Alexander* was, of all the Pagan Emperors, the moſt favourable and indulgent to the Chriſtians, as is evident from all the antient Writers, both Chriſtians and Pagans, yet he is repreſented in the Martyrologies, and in the Acts of ſome Martyrs, eſpecially of *Calliſtus*, to which *Bede* gave an intire Credit [i], as the moſt barbarous and inhuman Tyrant that ever ſhed Chriſtian Blood. If we reject theſe Acts, and we muſt either reject them, or the Authority of the moſt unexceptionable Writers among the Antients, we expunge at once above 300 Martyrs out of the Catalogue of Saints worſhipped to this Day by the Church of *Rome*, upon the bare Authority of ſuch Acts. Among theſe are the Conſul *Palmatius*, with his Wife, his Children, and Forty-two of his Domeſtics; the Senator *Simplicius*, with his Wife, and Sixty-eight of his Domeſtics: and, what will be an irreparable Loſs, the ſo much celebrated St. *Cæcilia*, in whoſe Honour Churches have been erected in every Chriſtian Kingdom. *Baronius* not preſuming on one Side to queſtion the Emperor *Alexander*'s Kindneſs to the Chriſtians, which would be giving the Lye to all the Antients, but, on the other, looking upon it as a Sacrilege to rob the Church of ſo many valuable Reliques, aſcribes the cruel Uſage they are ſuppoſed to have met with in that Prince's Reign, not to him, but to *Ulpian* the celebrated Civilian, who flouriſhed under him [k]. But in thoſe Acts the Martyrs are ſaid to have ſuffered unheard-of Torments, there minutely deſcribed, by the expreſs Command of the Emperor *Alexander*. Beſides, could *Alexander* be ſaid to have favoured the Chriſtians, could the Chriſtians be ſaid to have enjoyed a happy Tran-

The Acts of Calliſtus *deſerve no Credit.*

Many Saints ought to be expunged out of the Catalogue.

[h] Arring. l. 3. c. 11.
[i] Bed. Martyr. 10 Maii, 14 Oct.
[k] Bar ad ann. 226. n. 4.

HELIOGABALUS CALLISTUS, ALEXAND. SEVERUS.

Fifteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 219.

ZEphyrinus was ſucceeded by *Calliſtus*, or *Callixtus*, as he is ſtyled by *Optatus* [a], and St. *Auſtin* [b]. In his Time the Church enjoyed a long, happy, and uninterrupted Peace, as *Tertullian* calleth it [c], which laſted from the Death of *Severus* in 211, to the Reign of *Maximinus* in 235, as did alſo the State from the Death of *Macrinus* in 218, to the Year 233. *Alexander*, who ſucceeded *Heliogabalus* in 222, proved extremely favourable to the Chriſtians, and even allowed them, if I miſtake not the Meaning of a profane Writer, the free Exerciſe of their Religion [d]: it is at leaſt certain, that he adjudged to them, againſt the Tavern-keepers, a Piece of Ground, which it is pretended they had uſurped upon the Public, ſaying, when he gave Sentence in their Favour, that it was better God ſhould be ſerved on it in any Manner, than that it ſhould be occupied by Tavern-keepers [e]; which was giving them Leave to ſerve God on it after their own Manner. On this Spot of Ground, *Baronius* ſuppoſeth *Calliſtus* to have built a Church in Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, known at preſent by the Name of *Santa Maria in Traſtevere*, that is, *Saint Mary beyond the Tiber* [f]. But the Pontifical of *Damaſus*, upon which alone he foundeth his Opinion, deſerveth no Credit, as I ſhall ſhew in the Life of that Pope. *Calliſtus* is ſaid by *Anaſtaſius* [g] to have incloſed a large Piece of Ground on the *Appian* Way, to ſerve as a Burying-place for the Chriſtians. This Ground is frequently mentioned in the Martyrologies, and deſcribed at length by *Arringhus*,

The Emperor Alexander *favourable to the Chriſtians.*

Calliſtus's *Burying-place.*

[a] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [b] Aug. ep. 53. [c] Tert. de cor. mil. [d] Lamprit in vit. Alex. p. 121. Idem ib. p. 131. [f] Bar. ad ann. 224. n. 4, 5. [g] Anaſt. in vit. Call.

Arringhus, who telleth us, that 174000 Martyrs, and 46 Popes were buried in it [h]. Although *Alexander* was, of all the Pagan Emperors, the moſt favourable and indulgent to the Chriſtians, as is evident from all the antient Writers, both Chriſtians and Pagans, yet he is repreſented in the Martyrologies, and in the Acts of ſome Martyrs, eſpecially of *Calliſtus*, to which *Bede* gave an intire Credit [i], as the moſt barbarous and inhuman Tyrant that ever ſhed Chriſtian Blood. If we reject theſe Acts, and we muſt either reject them, or the Authority of the moſt unexceptionable Writers among the Antients, we expunge at once above 300 Martyrs out of the Catalogue of Saints worſhipped to this Day by the Church of *Rome*, upon the bare Authority of ſuch Acts. Among theſe are the Conſul *Palmatius*, with his Wife, his Children, and Forty-two of his Domeſtics; the Senator *Simplicius*, with his Wife, and Sixty-eight of his Domeſtics: and, what will be an irreparable Loſs, the ſo much celebrated St. *Cæcilia*, in whoſe Honour Churches have been erected in every Chriſtian Kingdom. *Baronius* not preſuming on one Side to queſtion the Emperor *Alexander*'s Kindneſs to the Chriſtians, which would be giving the Lye to all the Antients, but, on the other, looking upon it as a Sacrilege to rob the Church of ſo many valuable Reliques, aſcribes the cruel Uſage they are ſuppoſed to have met with in that Prince's Reign, not to him, but to *Ulpian* the celebrated Civilian, who flouriſhed under him [k]. But in thoſe Acts the Martyrs are ſaid to have ſuffered unheard-of Torments, there minutely deſcribed, by the expreſs Command of the Emperor *Alexander*. Beſides, could *Alexander* be ſaid to have favoured the Chriſtians, could the Chriſtians be ſaid to have enjoyed a happy Tran-

The Acts of Calliſtus deſerve no Credit.

Many Saints ought to be expunged out of the Catalogue.

[h] Arring. l. 3. c. 11.
[i] Bed. Martyr. 10 Maii, 14 Oct.
[k] Bar ad ann. 226. n. 4.

Tranquillity under him, had one of his Officers perſecuted them with the utmoſt Cruelty in his Name, and by his Authority? *Baronius*, not remembering, it ſeems, that in this Place he had charged *Ulpian* with all the Cruelties againſt the Chriſtians, ſuppoſeth elſewhere [l] ſeveral Martyrs to have ſuffered in the Reign of *Alexander*, after the Death of *Ulpian*. *Bede*, it is true, hath followed theſe Acts; but they are not on that Account at all the more credible, ſince he often followeth Pieces which are now univerſally given up as ſuppoſititious. The very firſt Words of theſe Acts are ſufficient to make us ſuſpect the Truth of them; for they begin thus; *In the Time of* Macrinus *and* Alexander——How come theſe two Princes to be joined together? *Macrinus* reigned with his Son *Diadumenus*, and *Heliogabalus* between them and *Alexander*. Soon after the Conſul *Palmatius* is ſaid to have been condemned without any Form of Judgment, without ſo much as being heard; whereas *Herodian* aſſureth us, that *Alexander* was a ſtrict Obſerver of the Laws; and that no Criminal was condemned in his Reign, but according to the uſual Courſe of Law, and by Judges of the greateſt Integrity [m]. *Calliſtus*, if we give Credit to his Acts, was kept a long time Priſoner in a private Houſe, where he was every Day cruelly beaten by the Emperor *Alexander*'s Orders, and at laſt thrown headlong out of the Window into a Well. The Acts are evidently fabulous, but *Calliſtus* nevertheleſs is worſhipped among the Martyrs; and the Waters of the Well, which is to be ſeen at *Rome* in the Church that beareth his Name, are ſaid to cure all ſorts of Diſeaſes to this Day. He governed the Church Five Years, and died in the Latter-end of the Year 223 [n], the Third of the Emperor *Alexander*. His Body is expoſed to public Adoration on the Tenth of *May*, in

Calliſtus not a Martyr.

[l] Idem ad ann. 232. n. 11.
[m] Herod. l. 6. p. 575, 588.
[n] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 21. & in chron.

in the Church of St. *Mary*, beyond the *Tyber*, at *Rome* [o], and in that of our Lady at *Rheims* [p]. Two Decretals are aſcribed to *Calliſtus*, and likewiſe the Inſtitution of the Ember-Weeks, but without the leaſt Foundation.

ALEXANDER.

URBANUS,

Sixteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

ALL I can find in the Antients concerning *Urban*, the Succeſſor of *Calliſtus*, is, that, during the whole Time of his Pontificate, both Church and State enjoyed a profound Peace under the Emperor *Alexander*; that he held the Chair near Seven Years, and died about the Middle of the Year 230 [q]. Great and wonderful Things are related of him in his Acts, and in thoſe of St. *Cæcilia*; but ſuch Acts [r] are evidently fabulous, ſince, in Oppoſition to all the Antients, they repreſent the Emperor *Alexander* as a moſt cruel Proſecutor of the Chriſtian Name. *Urban* himſelf is ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under him, and placed accordingly by the Church of *Rome* among her Martyrs. His Body is now worſhipped in an Abbey of his Name in the Dioceſe of *Chalons* on the *Marne, and in the Church of St.* Cæcilia *at* Rome [s].

Year of Chriſt 223.

The Acts of Urbanus *fabulous.*

[o] Bolland. 10. Maii, 498, 499. [p] Arring. l. 2. c. 12. Theod. l. 4. c. 1, 2, 6, 8. [q] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 26. [r] Bed. Martyr. & Boll. 25 Maii. [s] Eric. l. 1. c. 12. Bolland. 25. Maii.

ALEXANDER, PONTIANUS, MAXIMINUS.

Seventeenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 230. PONTIANUS succeeded *Urban* in 230, and governed, according to the Pontifical of *Bucherius* (A), Five Years, Two Months, and Seven Days;

(A) This Pontifical, well known to *Cuſpidian*, *F. Petau*, and other Chronologers, was publiſhed by *Bucherius* the *Jeſuit* in 1633, with the *Paſchal Cycle of Victorius*. It is a Catalogue of the Biſhops of *Rome*, from the Foundation of that See to the Time of *Liberius*, who was choſen in 352. As the Election of *Liberius* is marked, and not his Death, the Catalogue is ſuppoſed by ſome to have been written in his Time. His Election is marked thus; *Liberius fuit temporibus Conſtantii ex die* xi *Kalendas Junias in diem——a Conſulibus Conſtantio* V. *& Conſtantio Cæſare*——By *Conſtantius Cæſar* is meant *Gallus*, the Son of *Julius Conſtantius*, who, by his Father *Conſtantius Chlorus*, was Half-brother to *Conſtantine the Great*. *Gallus* was raiſed by the Emperor *Conſtantius* to the Dignity of *Cæſar* in the Year 351, on which Occaſion he gave him his own Name (1), and the following Year took him for his Collegue in his Fifth Conſulſhip, as appeareth from *Idatius*, from *Proſper*, and from the *Alexandrian* Chronicle. The above-mentioned Pontifical is very faulty in the Times preceding the Pontificate of *Pontianus*, who was choſen in 230, nay, if we believe *Bucherius*, *Anicetus*, *Eleutherius*, and *Zephyrinus*, are omitted in it. I ſaid, *If we believe* Bucherius; for *Bollandus*, another *Jeſuit*, who peruſed the ſame Manuſcript, aſſureth us, that he found there the Names of thoſe three Biſhops, which *Bucherius* aſſureth us were not to be found there (2). Which of the two *Jeſuits* is the honeſter is hard to determine in any Caſe, but impoſſible in this, unleſs the original Manuſcript ſhould be produced, which both peruſed. *F. Pagi*, the *Franciſcan*, ſeemeth to favour *Bucherius*; for he complaineth of *Bollandus* for interpolating the Manuſcript, and not publiſhing it with all its Faults and Chaſms, as *Bucherius* had done. But then he doth not tell us, that he had ſeen the original Manuſcript. *Bollandus* on the other hand complaineth of *Bucherius* undervaluing ſuch an unvaluable Piece; and ſettleth by it his whole Chronology of the Popes, pretending to have been ſent by Pope *Damaſus* to St. *Jerom* (3). But for this the only Ground he hath are ſome Letters

(1) Aurel. Vict. p. 518. Socr. l. 2. c. 28. (2) Bolland. Apr. t. 1. p. 22,—24. (3) Bolland. ib. p. 3. n. 10.

Days; that is, from the 22d of *July* 230, to the 28th of *September* 235[t]. In the Second Year of his Pontificate, the famous *Origen* was depoſed and excommunicated by *Demetrius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and the Sentence approved of by moſt other Biſhops, eſpecially by the Biſhop of *Rome*, who aſſembled, it ſeemeth, his Clergy on that Occaſion: For what elſe could St. *Jerom* mean, by telling us, that *Rome aſſembled her Senate againſt Origen*[u]? The calm and quiet

Origen *depoſed.*

[t] Bolland. April. t. 1. p. 25. [u] Ruf. in Hier. l. 2. p. 225.

Letters from *Damaſus* to St. *Jerom*, and from *Jerom* to *Damaſus*, which by the beſt Judges, are all thought ſuppoſititious. But even allowing it to have been ſent by *Damaſus* to St. *Jerom*, that ought not to recommend it more to our Eſteem than it did to his; and he ſeemeth to have paid very little Regard to it: for in his Book of *Illuſtrious Men*, which he wrote after the Death of *Damaſus*, he placeth *Clement* after *Anacletus*, although that Pontifical puts *Anacletus* after *Clement* (4).

What I have hitherto ſaid is to be underſtood with reſpect to the Times preceding the Pontificate of *Pontianus*; for, from his Time, the Pontifical of *Bucherius* is almoſt quite exact to the End, that is, to the Election of *Liberius*; and the more exact, the nearer it cometh to his Time. I ſaid *almoſt*, for it is not even thenceforth free from all Faults; but it hath fewer than any other antient Record that hath reached us; and it is on this Conſideration that, from the Time of *Pontianus*, I have preferred it to all others. With reſpect to his Predeceſſors, I have adopted the Chronology of *Euſebius*, where it doth not appear that he was miſtaken; for that he was miſtaken in ſome Points, is but too plain; and, for aught we know, he may have been ſo in many others. But as in thoſe dark Times we have no authentic Records, no indiſputable Authorities, to depend on, I thought it more adviſeable to tread in the Footſteps of ſo famous and antient a Writer, than, by attempting to open a new Way, perplex and confound both myſelf and the Reader, as *Pearſon*, *Dodwell*, and *Pagi*, have done. And it was not, I muſt own, without ſome Concern, that I found a Man of Dr. *Pearſon*'s Learning reduced, by undervaluing the Authority of *Euſebius*, to take for his Guide a Writer of no Authority at all, *viz.* *Eutychius* of *Alexandria*, who flouriſhed ſo late as the Tenth Century, and is only famous for his Blunders, even in what relateth to his own Church.

To

(4) Hier. de vir. illuſtr, c. 15.

quiet Days, which the Church had for ſome Years enjoyed, eſpecially under *Alexander*, expired almoſt with the Pontificate of *Pontianus*; for that excellent Prince being aſſaſſinated in the Month of *May* 235, *Maximinus*, who ſucceeded him, out of Hatred to him, began to proſecute with great Cruelty the Chriſtians, whom he had ſo much favoured, eſpecially the Biſhops[x]. *Pontianus* among the reſt was baniſhed *Rome*, and confined to the unwholſome Iſland of *Sardinia*[y], where he died the ſame Year on the 28th of *September*, but of what Kind of Death is not well known[z].

The Perſecution of Maximinus.

Pontianus *baniſhed to* Sardinia.

Maximinus.

ANTERUS,

Eighteenth Bishop *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 235.

ANTERUS, the Succeſſor of *Pontianus*, preſided only One Month and Ten Days, and died

[x] Oroſ. l. 7. c. 19. [y] Vide Hallo. vit: Orig. p. 20. [z] Vide Boll. Apr. t. p. 25.

To the Pontifical were annexed, in the ſame antient Manuſcript, ſeveral other ſmall Pieces, *viz.* 1. A Liſt of the Conſuls from the Year 205, to 354, with the Epacts, Biſſextile Years, and the Day of the Week, with which each Year began. There are ſome Miſtakes in the Epacts, but the reſt is done with great Exactneſs. 2. Another Liſt of the Conſuls and Governors of *Rome*, from the Year 254, to 354. 3. A ſhort Necrology of the Biſhops of *Rome*, in which are marked, according to the Order of the Months, the Day on which each of them died, and the Place where he was buried. It beginneth with *Lucius*, and endeth with *Julius*. In this Liſt, *Sixtus* II. and *Marcellus* are omitted; the latter probably by a Miſtake of the Tranſcriber, confounding him with his Predeceſſor *Marcellinus*; and the former, perhaps, becauſe he is ſet down in the Calendar of Martyrs annexed to the Necrology. Theſe Pieces, as well as the Pontifical, all end at the Year 354, whence Cardinal *Noris* (5), and others, are of Opinion, that they were written that Year.

(5) Faſt. conſular. p. 23.

died on the 3d of *January* 236[a]. Some modern Writers place one *Cyriacus* between him and *Pontianus*; but their Opinion, founded on the Authority of the fabulous Acts of St. *Urſula*, is ſufficiently confuted by *Euſebius*[b], *Optatus*[c], St. *Auguſtine*[d], and *Nicephorus*[e], who all name *Anterus* as the immediate Succeſſor of *Pontianus*. The Shortneſs of his Pontificate, and the cruel Perſecution carried on by *Maximinus*, give us room to believe, that he died a Martyr, which Title is given him in the Martyrologies of St. *Jerom* and *Bede*[f].

Anterus probably died a Martyr.

MAXIMINUS, GORDIAN, **FABIANUS,** PHILIP, DECIUS.

Nineteenth BISHOP *of* Rome.

FABIANUS, called by the *Greeks*, *Fabius*, by *Eutychius*[g], and in the Chronicle of *Alexandria*, *Flavianus*[h], was according to *Euſebius*, miraculously choſen for Succeſſor to *Anterus*; for he telleth us, That the People and Clergy being aſſembled in order to proceed to a new Election, a Dove, unexpectedly appearing, ſettled, to the great Surprize of all preſent, on the Head of *Fabianus*, who was not ſo much as thought of, being but a Layman, as appeareth from the Account, and not an Inhabitant of *Rome*, but juſt then come out of the Country. At this Prodigy the whole Aſſembly cried out with one Voice, Fabianus *is our Biſhop*; and, crowding round him, placed him without further Delay on the Epiſcopal Throne.——Thus *Euſebius*[i]: and to his Account is owing the modern Notion, that the Pope is always choſen

Year of Chriſt 236.

His miraculous Election.

[a] Boll. pont. p. 28-32. [b] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 22. [c] Opt. contr. Par. l. 2. [d] Aug. ep. 195. [e] Niceph. chron. [f] Vide Flor. p. 995-997. [g] Euty. p. 384. [h] Chron. Al. p. 360. [i] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 29.

chosen by the Holy Ghost. *What happened in the Election of St.* Fabianus, (says Cardinal *Cusani*) *happened in the Election of every Pope. It is true we do not see the Holy Ghost with our corporeal Eyes; but we may and must see him, if we are not quite blind, with those of the Mind. In vain therefore, O eminent Electors, are all your Intrigues; the Person, on whose Head the heavenly Dove is pleased to perch, will, in spite of them, be chosen* [k]. In the Sequel of this History, we shall see such Monsters of Iniquity elected, and by such scandalous Practices, that to imagine the Holy Ghost any-ways concerned in the Election would be absolute Blasphemy.

Not all Popes thus chosen.

As for *Fabianus*, he seemeth to have been well worthy of the Post to which he was raised; for the famous Bishop of *Carthage*, St. *Cyprian*, in Answer to the Letter, wherein the Clergy of *Rome* gave him an Account of the glorious Death of their Bishop, called him *an excellent Man*; and addeth, that *the Glory of his Death, had answered the Purity, Holiness, and Integrity of his Life* [l]. From the Pontifical of *Bucherius* we learn, that he appointed Seven Deacons over the Fourteen Regions, or Wards, into which *Rome* was then divided [m], to take care of the Poor, saith *Baronius* [n]. We read in other more modern Pontificals, that he named Seven Subdeacons to overlook the Seven Notaries, who are supposed to have been first appointed by Pope *Clement*, and whose Province it was to commit to Writing the Actions and Speeches of the Martyrs. It is manifest from St. *Cyprian* [o], as Dr. *Pearson* well observes, that in the Time of *Cornelius*, the Successor of *Fabianus*, the Church of *Rome* had Seven Subdeacons, to whom St. *Cyprian* recommended the strictest Exactness in marking the Day of each Martyr's Death [p]. As for taking down their Speeches,

Fabianus worthy of the Dignity to which he was raised.

Some of his Regulations.

[k] Card. Cus. de meth. consistorii, c. 7. p. 85. [l] Cypr. ep. 4. & 31. [m] Buch. cycl. 271. [n] Bar. ad ann. 112. n. 9. [o] Cyp. ep. 37. [p] Pears. posth. p. 19.

Speeches, which ſome ſeem to object to, the Art of writing in Short-hand was well known in thoſe Times. *Euſebius* telleth us, that by *Tiro*, *Cicero*'s Freed-man, were firſt invented certain Marks, which ſtood not only for whole Words, but entire Sentences [q]. But this Invention is, by *Dio*, aſcribed to *Mæcenas*, who ordered his Freed-man *Aquila* to make them known to all who cared to learn them [r]. Of their wonderful Quickneſs in writing, with the Help of theſe Marks. *Martial* taketh notice, in one of his Diſtichs, ſaying, How faſt ſoever the Tongue may run, the Hand runneth faſter [s].

Said to have converted the Emperor Philip.

Baronius [t] and *Bollandus* [u] aſcribe to *Fabianus* the Converſion of the Emperor *Philip*, and his Son; adding, from the Acts of *Pontius* the Martyr, that he pulled down the great Temple of the *Romans*, that he daſhed to Pieces their Idols, and converted the whole City. What a Pity that ſuch wonderful Feats ſhould have been paſſed over in Silence by *Euſebius*, and all the Antients! As for the Converſion of *Philip*, and his Son, it is queſtioned by many, and very juſtly, the Silence of *Euſebius* alone being an unanſwerable Evidence againſt it; but all agree, that if he was inſtructed and converted by *Fabianus*, he did no great Honour either to his Inſtructor, or his Religion. In the latter End of the Year 249. the Emperor *Philip* being killed by the rebellious Soldiery at *Verona*, *Decius*, who was raiſed to the Empire in his Room, began his Reign with the moſt dreadful Perſecution that had ever yet afflicted the Church. *Fabianus* was one of the firſt that fell a Victim to the implacable Hatred this Emperor bore to the Chriſtian Name. He was put to Death on the 20th of *January* 250. while *Decius* was Conſul the ſecond time, together with *Gratus*, after having governed

Fabianus martyred in the Perſecution of Decius.

[q] Euſeb. in chron. [r] Dio Olymp. 193. ann. 4. [s] Mart. l. 14.
[t] Bar. ann 246. n. 9. [u] Boll. 20. Jan. p. 253.

verned the Church Fourteen Years, one Month, and Ten Days [w].

The See vacant. Year of Christ 250.

The Death of *Fabianus* was followed by a Vacancy, which lasted at least Sixteen Months, the Christians being either imprisoned, or so dispersed, that they could not assemble to choose a new Bishop. During this Interval, the Clergy, that is, the Presbyters and Deacons, took upon themselves the Care and Administration of all Ecclesiastical Matters; and, being informed by *Clementius*, Subdeacon of the Church of *Carthage*, who came to *Rome about Easter* in 250. that St. *Cyprian* had been obliged, by the Fury of the Persecution, to withdraw for a while from his See, they wrote to that Clergy, exhorting them to follow their Example [x]. Several excellent Letters passed on this Occasion between the Clergy of *Rome*, and St. *Cyprian* and his Clergy, especially concerning the Method they were to hold with the *Lapsed*; that is, with those who had either obtained of the Pagan Magistrates Protections, or *Libels of Safety*, whence they were called *Libellatici*, or had actually sacrificed to Idols, and were thence named *Sacrificati*. In one of these Letters, the *Roman* Clergy, after having maturely examined so material a Point, and advised not only with the neighbouring Bishops, but with others, who, from the distant Provinces, had fled for Concealment to *Rome*, declare it was their Opinion, That

The Opinion of the Roman *Clergy concerning the Lapsed.*

such of the Lapsed as were at the Point of Death, should, upon an unfeigned Repentance, be admitted to the Communion of the Church, but that the Cause of others should be put off till the Election of a new Bishop, when, together with him, with other Bishops, with the Priests, Deacons, Confessors, and Laymen, who had stood firm, they should take their Case into Consideration; adding, that a Crime committed by many ought not to be judged by one; and that a Decree could not be binding without the Con-

[w] Buch. cycl. p. 267. [x] Cypr. ep. 3.

Conſent and Approbation of many [y]. Could they in more plain and expreſs Terms diſown the Infallibility of the Pope their Biſhop? Could they upon mature Deliberation write thus, and at the ſame time believe his Judgment an infallible Rule? Such a Propoſition would in theſe Days be deemed heretical; and no Wonder; the Pope's Infallibility muſt be maintained at all Events; and to maintain it is impoſſible, without condemning, as heretical, the Doctrine taught by the Church in the firſt and pureſt Ages.

They diſown the Pope's Infallibility.

DECIUS, **CORNELIUS,** GALLUS.

Twentieth BISHOP *of* Rome.

AFTER the See had been vacant for the Space of Sixteen Months, *Cornelius*, a Preſbyter of the Church of *Rome*, was at laſt elected [z], on the 4th of *June* 251, according to the moſt probable Opinion [a]. He was, according to St. *Cyprian* [b], a Man of an unblemiſhed Character, and, on account of his peaceable Temper, his great Modeſty, his Integrity, and many other eminent Virtues, well worthy of the Dignity to which he was raiſed. He did not attain at once, ſays the ſame Writer, to the Height of the Prieſthood, but after he had paſſed through all the inferior Degrees, agreeably to the Diſcipline of the Church. He was ſo far from uſing Intrigues, from intruding himſelf by Violence, as ſome have done, that Violence was neceſſary to make him accept of the Dignity offered him. He was ordained Biſhop, continueth St. *Cyprian*, by ſome of our Collegues, who, being then at *Rome*, conformed to the Judgment

Year of Chriſt 251.

The Character of Cornelius by St. Cyprian.

[y] Cypr. ep. 31. Aug. ep. 165, &c. [z] Euſeb. chron. & l. 6. c. 33. Opt. lib. 2. [a] Vide Pearſ. Cyp. an. p. 29. n. 6. [b] Cypr. ep. 52.

Judgment of the whole People and Clergy [c]. As *Decius* was ſtill alive, who had declared, that he had rather bear with a Competitor to his Crown, than with a Biſhop of *Rome* [d], the Chriſtians, in all Likelihood, laid hold of the Opportunity, which the Revolt of *Valens* gave them, to chooſe a new Biſhop; for this very Year *Julius Valens* revolting cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed Emperor in *Rome* [e]; and though he held the Empire but a very ſhort time, yet his Revolt might divert *Decius* for a while from perſecuting the Chriſtians.

Novatianus refuſeth to acknowlege him.

Though *Cornelius* was choſen by the unanimous Voice of the People and Clergy, yet *Novatian*, a Preſbyter of the Church of *Rome*, who aſpired at the ſame Dignity, not only refuſed to acknowlege him; but having gained a conſiderable Party among the People, Five Preſbyters and ſome Confeſſors, he wrote in their Name and his own to St. *Cyprian*, and no doubt to many other Biſhops, laying heinous Crimes to the Charge of *Cornelius*; namely, his having ſued for a Protection from the Pagan Magiſtrates, which was ranking him among the *Libellatici*, who were excluded from all Dignities and Employments in the Church. St. *Cyprian* having received this Letter, and at the ſame time one from *Cornelius*, acquainting him with his Election, as was cuſtomary in thoſe Times among Biſhops, he cauſed the one to be read in a full Aſſembly of the People and Clergy, but ſuppreſſed the other, looking upon it as a ſcandalous Libel [f]. However, to prevent the Calumnies and falſe Reports that might be ſpread abroad by *Novatian* and his Partiſans, he aſſembled a Council of all the Biſhops of his Province, who, hearing of the Schiſm in the Church of *Rome*, reſolved to ſend thither two of their Body, who ſhould carefully inform themſelves of what had paſſed in the late Election,

Writes to St. Cyprian againſt him.

St. Cyprian calleth a Council.

[c] Cypr. ep. 52. [d] Idem ibid. [e] Aur. Vict. [f] Idem ep. 42.

lection, and on their Return make a faithful Report of all they had learnt. Purſuant to this Reſolution, *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus*, two *African* Biſhops, were diſpatched to *Rome*, with Letters from the Council to the Clergy of that City, and to the Biſhops who had been preſent at the Ordination of *Cornelius*. The Biſhops no ſooner received theſe Letters than they anſwered them, aſſuring their Brethren in *Africa*, that *Cornelius* had been lawfully choſen; and at the ſame time commending him as a Perſon, on account of his extraordinary Piety, and exemplary Life, moſt worthy of the Dignity to which he had been raiſed. Their Teſtimony was ſoon after confirmed by *Caldonius* and *Fortunatus* returning from *Rome*, and likewiſe by *Stephanius* and *Pompeius*, two *African* Biſhops, who had aſſiſted at the Ordination of *Cornelius*; ſo that he was univerſally acknowleged all over *Africa*[s]. *which acknowlegeth* Cornelius.

The *African* Biſhops no ſooner acknowleged *Cornelius* than they acquainted him with the Reſolutions, which they had taken in their late Council, with reſpect to the Lapſed. The Subſtance of theſe was, that ſuch as had yielded to the Fury of the Perſecution ought not to be abandoned, leſt, giving themſelves up to Deſpair, they ſhould fall into a total Apoſtaſy; but ſhould be re-admitted to the Union of the Church upon a ſincere Repentance, and after a long Penance: that the Time of their Penance ſhould be ſhortened, or prolonged, according to the Nature of their Crimes; that is, the *Libellatici* ſhould have a ſhorter Time aſſigned them; and the *Sacrificati*, called alſo *Thurificati*, who had actually offered Sacrifice, or Frankincenſe, to Idols, ſhould not be admitted until they had expiated their Offence by a very long Penance; but that both the *Libellatici* and *Sacrificati* ſhould be taken in, before the Time of their Penance was expired, if at the Point of Death, or even *Reſolutions of the Council of* Africa *concerning the Lapſed.*

[s] Cypr. ep. 41, 42, 45.

even thought to be in Danger [h]. As to fallen Bishops, they were to be dealt with in the same Manner; and, after due Penance, or, as it is sometimes called, Satisfaction, be admitted only in a Lay Capacity [i]. *Cornelius* did not, upon the Receipt of these Determinations or Decrees, step into his oracular Chair, and thence, as an infallible Judge, condemn or approve them. Such arbitrary Proceedings would not have been well relished by the Bishops of *Africa*, nor even by his own Clergy, who not long before had declared, That *a Decree could not be binding without the Consent and Approbation of many*. He therefore acted on this Occasion as St. *Cyprian* had done, as other Bishops did afterwards; that is, he assembled a Council, which *Eusebius* calleth *a great Council* [k]; for it consisted of Sixty Bishops, and a great Number of Priests, Deacons, and Laymen, who, in those Times, were admitted to all Councils [l]. By this Venerable Assembly were the Decrees of the Council of *Africa* examined and approved, and then sent to be in like-manner examined and approved by other Bishops, until the whole Church had agreed to them [m].

Which are approved by the Council of Rome.

At the Council of *Rome* assisted among other Presbyters *Novatian*, but as he maintained, in Opposition to the whole Assembly, that the Lapsed were to be admitted upon no Terms or Satisfaction whatsoever, but should be left to the Divine Tribunal, he was himself cut off from that Communion, which, with an invincible Obstinacy, he denied to others [n]. Provoked at this Sentence, he readily gave Ear to the Insinuations of *Novatus*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Carthage*, who had fled from thence to *Rome*, to avoid the Sentence of Excommunication, with which he was threatened by St. *Cyprian*, and the other Bishops of *Africa*, for his scandalous Doctrine, and irregular

Novatian *excommunicated.*

[h] Cypr. ep. 52, 54. [i] Idem ep. 68. [k] Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. [l] Pacian. ep. 3. [m] Euseb. l. 6. c. 24. [n] Theodoret. hær. fab. l. 3. c. 5.

regular Practices [o]. *Pacianus* painteth him in the blackeſt Colours: He ſtripped the Orphans, ſaith he, plundered the Widows of the Church of *Carthage*, and appropriated to himſelf the Money belonging to the Poor and the Church [p]: He turned his Father out of Doors, and let him die of Hunger in the Streets, and would not even be at the Trouble of burying him after his Death. With a Kick in the Belly he made his Wife miſcarry, and bring forth a dead Child; whence *Pacian* calleth him a Traitor, an Aſſaſſin, the Murderer of his Father and Child [q]. As for his Doctrine, he held, while at *Carthage*, Tenets diametrically oppoſite to thoſe he taught at *Rome*: for, at *Carthage*, he was for admitting to the Communion of the Church not only the Lapſed, but all other Sinners, let their Crimes be ever ſo heinous, without any Sort of Penance; and, at *Rome*, for excluding them, let their Penance be ever ſo long, let their Repentance be ever ſo ſincere [r]. At *Carthage* he found *Feliciſſimus*, of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, inclined to Lenity; and *Novatian*, at *Rome*, to Severity: and therefore, as he was a Man of great Vanity, and no Principles, he ſuited himſelf to the different Tempers of ſuch as he judged the moſt capable of raiſing him. At *Rome*, by a Pretence to an uncommon Sanctity and Severity, he gained a great many Followers, and among them ſome Confeſſors lately delivered out of Priſon, from whom he extorted Letters directed to *Novatian*, wherein they conſented to the Ordination of the ſaid *Novatian*. In virtue of theſe Letters he was accordingly ordained, ſome ſay in *Rome* [s], others in a neighbouring Village [t], by Three Biſhops ſent for by *Novatus* out of the Country for that Purpoſe, and quite unacquainted with his Views. Being thus ordained Biſhop, he was ſet up by

Novatus his Wickedneſs.

He gaineth many Followers, and ſome Confeſſors, to the Party of Novatian.

[o] Pacian. ep. 3. Hier. vir. ill. c. 70. Cypr. ep. 49. [p] Pacian. ep. 3. [q] Id. ib. et ep. 2. [r] Cyp. ep. 40, 49. [s] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [t] Theod. l. 3. c. 5.

Novatian *the first* Anti-pope.

by the Party againſt *Cornelius*, whom they charged with relaxing the Diſcipline of the Church, and communicating with the Lapſed, eſpecially with one *Trophimus*. This St. *Cyprian* calleth a falſe and groundleſs Charge; for, as to *Trophimus*, though he was in the Number of the *Thurificati*, that is, though he had offered Frankincenſe to Idols, and even perſuaded his Flock (for he was a Preſbyter, if not a Biſhop) to follow his Example, yet he had ſufficiently atoned for his Crime, by a ſincere Repentance, by a long Penance, and above all, by bringing back his People with him, who would not have returned without him [u]. As for the others, it is true, he communicated, with ſome who had not fulfilled the Time of Penance aſſigned them, but ſuch only, as, being admitted at the Point of Death, had afterwards recovered; which can no otherwiſe be avoided, ſaith St. *Cyprian* [w], but by killing thoſe to whom we granted the Peace of the Church, when we apprehended them to be in Danger. *Novatian* having thus, by a pretended Zeal for the Diſcipline of the Church, and the artful Inſinuations of *Novatus*, ſeduced a great many at *Rome*, who ſtyled themſelves the *Catharti*, that is, the pure, undefiled Party; he wrote in their and his own Name to the other Churches, acquainting them with his Ordination, exhorting them not to communicate with the Lapſed upon any Terms, and bitterly complaining of the ſcandalous Lenity and Remiſſneſs of *Cornelius* [x]. At the ſame time *Cornelius* wrote to the other Biſhops, giving them a faithful Account of all that had happened at *Rome*, eſpecially of the uncanonical Ordination of *Novatian*. However, the Letters of *Novatian*, ſigned by ſeveral Confeſſors, who were greatly reſpected in thoſe Days, made no ſmall Impreſſion on *Antonianus* an *African* Biſhop, and *Fabius* Biſhop of *Antioch* [y], but quite gained over to the Party

He acquaints the other Churches with his Ordination.

[u] Cyp. ep. 54. [w] Idem. ib. [x] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 45. Socrat. l. 4. c. 28. Hier. vir. ill. c. 69. [y] Cypr. ep. 52. Euſeb. l. 6. c. 44.

Party of *Marcianus* Biſhop of *Arles* [z]. The other Biſhops declared all to a man for *Cornelius*, eſpecially St. *Cyprian*, and thoſe of his Province, who, being aſſembled in a Council when the Deputies of *Novatianus* arrived, excommunicated without farther Examination both him and them [a]; and well they might, ſince they had taken ſo much Pains to inform themſelves of the Lawfulneſs of *Cornelius*'s Election, as we have related above. The Deputies, although thus rejected with Scorn and Diſgrace by the Council, did not abandon the Enterprize, but proſelyting from Town to Town, nay, from Houſe to Houſe, inveigled a great many, under colour of communicating with the Confeſſors [b]. St. *Cyprian* therefore, whoſe Zeal was not confined within the Bounds, however extenſive, of *Africa*, *Numidia*, and the Two *Mauritanias*, to withdraw this main Support from the Party, wrote a ſhort but nervous Letter to the Confeſſors, deploring the Fault they had committed, by conſenting to the unlawful Ordination of *Novatianus*, and exhorting them to return with all Speed to the Catholic Church [c]. *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* wrote them a pathetic Letter to the ſame Purpoſe [d]; and theſe Letters had at laſt the deſired Effect; but not before *Novatus*, who had drawn them into the Schiſm, left *Rome*; which happened on the following Occaſion:

His Deputies rejected and excommunicated in Africa.

St. Cyprian endeavoureth to reclaim the Confeſſors.

Novatianus, being informed that the Deputies he had ſent into *Africa*, were every-where rejected and deſpiſed, reſolved to ſend others, whom he judged, on account of their Rank and Authority, more capable of promoting his Deſign [e]. The Perſons he pitched upon were *Nicoſtratus*, *Novatus*, *Evariſtus*, *Primus*, and *Dionyſius*. Of the Two laſt I find no farther Mention made in Hiſtory; of *Novatus* I have ſpoken

Novatian *ſendeth new Deputies into* Africa.

[z] Cypr. ep. 67 [a] Idem ib. [b] Idem ep. 47, 79.
[c] Idem ep. 44. [d] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 46. [e] Cyp. ep. 48.

ſpoken above; and as for *Evariſtus* and *Nicoſtratus*, the former was a Biſhop, and is ſuppoſed to have been one of the Three that ordained *Novatian*. *Nicoſtratus* was a Deacon of the Church of *Rome* [f], and had been impriſoned with the Two Preſbyters *Moſes* and *Maximus*, for the Confeſſion of the Faith [g], which intitled him to a Place among the Confeſſors.

Their Characters.

To theſe Three St. *Cyprian* aſcribes the excellent Letter, as he ſtyleth it, which the Confeſſors of *Rome* wrote to thoſe of *Carthage* [h]. He was likewiſe one of the Confeſſors, who wrote to St. *Cyprian* himſelf, as appeareth from the Title of that admirable Letter, which runs thus: *The Presbyters* Moſes *and* Maximus, *the Deacons* Nicoſtratus *and* Ruffinus, *and the other Confeſſors who are with them, to Pope* Cyprian [i].

The Name of Pope antiently common to all Biſhops.

We may here obſerve, by the way, that the Name of *Pope*, which ſignifieth no more than *Father*, was anciently common to all Biſhops; but was afterwards, by a ſpecial Decree of *Gregory* VII, appropriated to the Biſhop of *Rome*. To return to *Nicoſtratus*, the Character given him by St. *Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, beſpeaketh him quite unworthy of being joined with the others who are named in that Letter; and were all Men of great Piety: for he had ſquandered away the Money belonging to the Church, that was lodged in his Hands, embezzled that of the Widows and Orphans, and defrauded a Lady, who had truſted him with the Management of her Affairs [k].

The Deputies are everywhere rejected in Africa.

Theſe new Deputies met with no better Reception than the former had done: for St. *Cyprian*, being informed of their Departure from *Rome*, by the Confeſſor *Augendus* [l], and ſoon after of their Characters by the Acolyte *Nicephorus*, both ſent, for that Purpoſe, by *Cornelius* [m], he acquainted therewith the other Catholic Biſhops, who, upon that Intelligence, rejected them with the greateſt Indignation, as Apoſtates,

[f] Idem ep. 49. [g] Buch. p. 271. [h] Cyp. ep. 23. [i] Idem. ep. 26. [k] Idem. ep. 48, 49. [l] Idem. ep. 48. [m] Idem. ep. 49.

ſtates, and Firebrands of Sedition. Hereupon the Deputies having, by the Means and Contrivance of *Novatus*, procured ſome of their Party to be ordained Biſhops, and *Nicoſtratus* among the reſt, they named them to the Sees of the Catholic Biſhops; which bred great Confuſion and Diſorder in the Church, it being a difficult Matter for the Biſhops in the diſtant Provinces to diſtinguiſh between their lawful Brethren and the Intruders, and conſequently to know whom they ſhould admit to, and whom they ſhould exclude from, their Communion. But, againſt this Evil, a Remedy was found by St. *Cyprian*, and the other *African* Biſhops, who, to arm him againſt the Craft and Arts of thoſe ſubtle Impoſtors, tranſmitted to him a Liſt of the Catholic Biſhops of that Province [n].

The Confeſſors return to the Communion of the Church.

The Storm, which *Novatus* had raiſed in *Rome*, was laid by his Departure; for he was no ſooner gone, than the Confeſſors, whom he had ſeduced, *viz.* *Maximus*, *Urbanus*, *Sidonius*, and *Macarius*, ſignified to *Cornelius* their eager Deſire of quitting his Party, and returning to the Communion of the Church. *Cornelius* queſtioned, at firſt, their Sincerity; but being convinced of it at laſt, he aſſembled his Clergy, not caring to truſt to his own Judgment, in order to adviſe with them, in what manner he ſhould proceed in the preſent Caſe. At this Council aſſiſted, beſides the *Roman* Clergy, Five Biſhops, who either happened to be then at *Rome*; or, on this Occaſion, had been invited thither by *Cornelius*. They were ſcarce met, when the Confeſſors attended by a great Croud, appeared before them, teſtifying, with a Flood of Tears, the Sincerity of their Repentance, and begging they would forget their paſt criminal Conduct. The Council did not think it adviſeable to come to any Reſolution, till they had acquainted the People with the Requeſt of the Confeſſors;

[n] Cyp. ep. 55.

sors; which they no sooner did, than the People flocked to the Place, and, not upbraiding, but embracing, with Tears of Joy, their retrieved Brethren, and with the same Tenderness as if they had been just then delivered out of Prison, pointed out to the Council the Method they were to pursue. Accordingly *Cornelius*, having, with the Approbation of the Council, made them renounce the Errors of *Novatian*, and acknowledge him for the only lawful Bishop of *Rome*, re-admitted them, without farther Satisfaction to the Communion of the Church [o]. From this Account I should imagine, that those who accompanied the Confessors, at their first appearing before the Council, were *Novatians*, whom they had brought back with them; but I dare not affirm it, since St. *Cyprian*, in his Answer to *Cornelius*, speaketh only of the Four above-mentioned Confessors. The Confessors being thus returned, to the inexpressible Joy of the whole People, *Cornelius* impatient to impart the good News to St. *Cyprian*, wrote to him, as soon as the Council broke up, to acquaint him with what had happened, and invite him to partake of the common Joy to which he had so much contributed [p]. With this Letter *Nicephorus* the Acolyte embarked, without Delay for *Africa*; and thence returned soon after with an Answer, wherein St. *Cyprian* assured *Cornelius*, that the Return of the Confessors had caused an universal Joy in *Africa*, both for their sake, and because it might open the Eyes of many, and prove in the end the Ruin of the schismatic Party [q]. The Confessors themselves wrote to St. *Cyprian*, upon their Return [r], who immediately answered them [s]; and, in all Likelihood, to the other chief Bishops of the Church, since *Eusebius* informs us, that *Dionysius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, wrote twice to them after their Return [t]. In the mean time, *Novatian*, seeing great Num-

How received.

Cornelius *acquainteth St.* Cyprian *with their Return.*

The Confessors write to St. Cyprian.

[o] Cypr. ep. 46. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. [p] Cyp. ep. 46. [q] Idem ep. 47. [r] Idem ep. 50. [s] Idem ep. 51. [t] Euseb. l. 6. c. 43.

Numbers, moved by the Example of the Confeſſors, daily fall off from his Party, to keep the reſt ſteady by the moſt ſacred Ties, uſed, in adminiſtring the Euchariſt, to hold the Hands of thoſe who received it, with the holy Bread in them, between his, and oblige them to ſwear, *by the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, that they would never abandon him, nor return to *Cornelius* [u].

In what manner Novatian endeavoured to keep the reſt ſteady.

As the Church of *Rome* was rent by the Schiſm of *Novatian*, ſo was the Church of *Carthage* by that of *Feliciſſimus*; and as the former, upon his being excommunicated by *Cornelius*, and the Council of *Rome*, had recourſe to St. *Cyprian*, in like manner the latter, being cut off from the Communion of the Church by St. *Cyprian*, and the Council of *Carthage*, had recourſe to *Cornelius*. But as the Doctrine of *Feliciſſimus*, though diametrically oppoſite to that of *Novatian*, was equally repugnant to the Catholic Truth, to the Diſcipline eſtabliſhed in the Church, as I have obſerved above, he was at firſt rejected by *Cornelius*, with great ſteadineſs and Reſolution. But the Biſhop of *Rome* had, at laſt, been frightened into a Compliance, had he not been animated and encouraged by St. *Cyprian*: for the Followers of *Feliciſſimus* having, in imitation of the *Novatians*, appointed one of their own Faction, named *Fortunatus*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, *Feliciſſimus* took upon himſelf to carry to *Cornelius* the Letters of the new and Third Biſhop of that City. Accordingly he ſet out for *Rome*, attended by a Troop of ſeditious, deſperate, and abandoned Men, ſays St. *Cyprian* [w]. *Cornelius* rejected them at firſt with great Firmneſs, and immediately acquainted St. *Cyprian* with what had paſſed; but *Feliciſſimus* threatening to read publickly the Letters he had brought, if *Cornelius* did not receive them, and to diſcover many ſcandalous things, he was not a little intimidated. He therefore wrote a ſecond Letter

A Schiſm in the Church of Carthage.

[u] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [w] Idem ep. 55.

ter to St. *Cyprian*, but betrayed in it a great deal of Fear and Weakneſs: however, the excellent Letter, which St. *Cyprian* wrote in Anſwer to his, inſpired him with new Vigour, and kept him ſteady [x].

The Perſecution renewed by Gallus.

In the mean time, *Decius* being killed, the Perſecution was carried on, or rather renewed, with more Vigour than ever, by *Gallus* his Succeſſor. As the *Roman* Empire was, at this Time, afflicted with a dreadful Plague, *Gallus*, who, it ſeemeth, had not moleſted the Chriſtians during the firſt Months of his Reign [y], iſſued an Order, injoining Men of all Ranks and Profeſſions to offer Sacrifice to the Gods, hoping, by that means to appeaſe their Wrath, and put a Stop to the raging Evil. It was on Occaſion of this Plague, that St. *Cyprian* wrote his excellent Diſcourſe on *Mortality*, wherein he ſo eloquently teacheth a Chriſtian to triumph over the Fears of Death, and ſheweth with how little Reaſon we mourn for thoſe Friends and Relations who are ſnatched from us. Such of the Chriſtians as refuſed to comply with the Emperor's Edict, were either baniſhed or executed.

Cornelius *apprehended.*

Cornelius, among the reſt, was apprehended at the firſt breaking out of the Perſecution, and made a glorious Confeſſion of the Faith, as appeareth from St. *Cyprian*, who, on that Occaſion, wrote him a Letter of Congratulation [z]. What happened to him afterwards is uncertain; for his Acts are evidently fabulous, though they have been received by *Bede*, by *Ado*, by *Anaſtaſius*, and many others, far more conſiderable for their Number than their Authority. We read in the Pontifical of *Bucherius*, that he was baniſhed to *Centumcellæ*, now *Civita-vecchia*, and died of a natural Death, according to the Expreſſion uſed there [a] (*Dormitionem accepit*). As to the Title of Martyr, with which he is diſtinguiſhed by St. *Jerom* [b], it was antiently given to all thoſe, who, for the

[x] Euſeb. ep. 55. [y] Idem ep. 54. [z] Idem ep. 57.
[a] Buch. p. 271. [b] Hier. vit. Paul. 237.

the Confeſſion of Faith, died in Priſon, which in all Likelihood happened to *Cornelius* (A).

Cornelius died on the ſame Day of the Month and the Week, on which St. *Cyprian* was martyred Six Years after[c]; that is, on the 14th of *September*, 252. according to the moſt probable Opinion, having held the Pontificate one Year, three Months, and Ten Days. His Body is ſuppoſed to have been tranſlated from *Civita-vecchia* to the Cemetery of *Caliſtus*; for near that Place Pope *Leo* I. is ſaid to have built, in Honour of *Cornelius*, a Baſilic, or magnificent Church[d]. His Body was believed to be ſtill at *Rome* in the End of the Eighth Century; for *Anaſtaſius* telleth us, that Pope *Adrian* placed it in a Church, *His Reliques.*

[c] Hier. vir. ill. c. 67. [d] Flor. p. 828, 830.

(A) *Cornelius* is reckoned, by St. *Jerom*, among the Eccleſiaſtic Writers, on account of the Four Letters which he wrote to *Fabius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, who ſeemed not to diſlike the Tenets of *Novatian* (1). He wrote ſeveral other Letters, whereof Two are ſtill extant among thoſe of St. *Cyprian* (2); and ſome Fragments of his Fourth Letter to *Fabius* have been tranſmitted to us by *Euſebius*. As for the Letter to *Lupicinus*, Biſhop of *Vienne*, which was found in the Archives of that Church, and publiſhed by Father *du Boſc*, the Cardinals *Baronius* (3) and *(Bona)* think it genuine; but it is, without all Doubt, ſuppoſititious: for, according to *Ado* and *Baronius* himſelf (5), *Florentius*, whom *Lupicinus* is ſuppoſed to have ſucceeded, was raiſed to that See in the Reign of *Maximus*, or *Gordian*, about the Year 258, ſo that in 252, when *Cornelius* died, *Lupicinus* was not yet Biſhop. Beſides in the Title of the Letter which *Baronius* hath ſuppreſſed, *Lupicinus* is ſtyled *Archbiſhop*; which Title was not known then, nor long after. The Letter is therefore rejected by *Launoy* (6), and Dr. *Pearſon* (7), as a forged and ſpurious Piece. *Eraſmus* aſcribeth to *Cornelius* the Treatiſe on Charity (8); and *du Pin* both that, and the other on the public Shews, with the Diſcourſe againſt *Novatian* (9), which are all to be found among St. *Cyprian*'s Works.

(1) Hier. vir. ill. c. 66. p. 290. (2) Cyp. ep. 46, 48. (3) Bar. ad ann, 255. n. 47. (4) Bano lit. l. 1. c. 3. p. 13. (5) Bar. ad ann. 262. n. 58. (6) Laun. Ger. l. 4. c. 6. (7) Pearſ. Cyp. ann. p. 37. (8) Eraſ. Cyp. p. 417. (9) Du Pin. t. 1. p. 469.

a Church, which he had built in *Capracoro* e; but it was ſoon after removed from thence, and brought into *France* by *Charlemagne*, as *Pamelius* aſſureth us, upon the Authority of a ſmall Life of St. *Cyprian*, written as he ſuppoſeth, by *Paulus Diaconus* f. (B).

Euſebius obſerveth, that, in the Time of *Cornelius*, the Church of *Rome* was in a moſt flouriſhing Condition; for, not to mention the People, who were almoſt without Number, it conſiſted of 46 Preſbyters, 7 Subdeacons, 42 Acolytes, 52 Exorciſts, Lectors, and Janitors, or Door-keepers, and 2500 Widows, and other Poor, who were all maintained by the Alms and Offerings of the Faithful g.

GALLUS, **LUCIUS.** VOLUSIANUS.

Twenty firſt BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 252. *He is baniſhed.*

LUCIUS was no ſooner named to ſucceed *Cornelius*, than he was apprehended, and ſent, with many others into Baniſhment; for St. *Cyprian* wrote him

e Anaſt. c. 46. p. 27. f Pamel. prolog. in S. Cyp. p. 19. g Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43.

(B) There is a famous Abbey, bearing the Name, at *Compiegne* in the Iſle of *France*, where his Reliques, and thoſe of St. *Cyprian*, are ſuppoſed to be kept in the ſame Shrine. But how can we reconcile this with what we read in the Council of *Rheims*, held in 1049, under *Leo* IX. *viz.* that the Body of *Cornelius* was removed by the Clergy of *Compiegne*, from that City to *Rheims*; and received there by the Pope (1)? But on the other hand, the Council is contradicted by *Aubertus de Mira*, who aſſureth us, that in 860 the Reliques of Pope *Cornelius* were tranſlated from the Abbey of *Inde*, ſtanding about four Miles South of *Aix la Chapelle*, to that of *Roſnay*, which is at preſent, a Collegiate Church in *Flanders*, between *Oudenarde* and *Tournay*. In this Church is ſtill to be ſeen a Shrine, ſuppoſed to contain, as appears from the Inſcription, the Bones of St. *Cornelius* and St. *Cyprian* (2).

(1) Conc. t. 9. p. 1093, 1042. (2) Vide Bolland. 12 Feb. p. 607. et Pamel. p. 23.

him a Letter, in the Name of his Collegues, and his own, congratulating him, at the ſame time, on his Promotion, and his Exile, as appeareth from St. *Cyprian*'s Second Letter to him[h]; for his Firſt hath not reached our Times. *Lucius* had been but a very ſhort time in Baniſhment, when he was recalled, to the inexpreſſible Joy of his Flock, who, it ſeemeth, crouded out to meet him[i]. On this Occaſion St. *Cyprian* wrote him a Second Letter, ſtill extant[k], wherein he teſtifieth the Joy with which the News of his Return had been received by him, and his Brethren in *Africa*. He returned to *Rome* during the Heat of the Perſecution; but what occaſioned his Return we are no-where told. St. *Cyprian* ſaith, in his Second Letter to him, that he was perhaps recalled to be immolated in the Sight of his Flock, that they might be animated and encouraged by the Example of his Chriſtian Conſtancy and Reſolution[l]; which happened accordingly; for he had not governed Eight whole Months, ſays *Euſebius*[m], no, nor Six, according to the moſt probable Opinion, but only Five, and a few Days, when he died a Martyr; for that Title is given him by St. *Cyprian*[n]. He was beheaded ſay the Martyrologies; but on this Point the Antients are ſilent; and his dying in Priſon had given him a juſt Claim to that Title. His Body is ſuppoſed to have been diſcovered intire, in the Church of St. *Cæcilia* at *Rome*, in 1599, although the Church of *Roſkield*, in the Iſle of *Zealand*, had long before pretended to his Head[o].

Returneth to Rome.

And dieth a Martyr.

[h] Cyp. ep. 58. [i] Idem ib. [k] Idem. ep. 58. [l] Idem ib. [m] Euſeb. lib. 7. c. 2. [n] Cypr. ep. 67. [o] Boland. 4 Mart. p. 301, 302.

STEPHEN,

STEPHEN,

Twenty-second BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 253.

The Biſhops of Gaul *write to* Stephen.

STEPHEN, who ſucceeded *Lucius*, in 253, ſoon after his Election, received a Letter from *Fauſtinus*, Biſhop of *Lions*, written in the Name of all his Collegues in *Gaul*, informing him, that *Marcian*, Biſhop of *Arles*, having embraced the Doctrine of *Novatian*, had denied the Communion of the Church to the Lapſed, even at the Point of Death. At the ſame time they wrote to St. *Cyprian*, and on the ſame Subject[a], not caring to come to any vigorous Reſolution againſt their Collegue, without the Advice and Approbation of other Biſhops, eſpecially of *Rome* and *Carthage*; the former being eminent for the Dignity of his See, and the latter for his known Zeal, Piety, and Learning. But *Fauſtinus* did not find in the Biſhop of *Rome* the Zeal he expected; and therefore he wrote a ſecond Letter to St. *Cyprian*, exhorting him to animate the others by his Example[b]; which that zealous Prelate did accordingly: for he wrote immediately to *Stephen*, preſſing him to diſpatch, without Delay, full and ample Letters to the Biſhops of *Gaul*; that, finding themſelves thus backed and ſupported, they might thereby be encouraged to depoſe *Marcian*, and name another in his room. It is not to be doubted, but the Biſhop of *Carthage*, who had the Welfare of the Church, at leaſt, as much at Heart as the Biſhop of *Rome*, did himſelf what he encouraged the others to do; but I cannot poſſitively aſſirm it, ſince his Anſwer to *Fauſtinus* is loſt. As to the Iſſue of this Affair, the Antients have left us quite in the Dark (A), St. *Cy-*

[a] Cypr. ep. 67. [b] Idem ib.

(A) *Marcian*'s Name is not in the Liſt of the Biſhops of *Arles*, publiſhed by *F. Fabillon*: whence ſome modern Writers have con-

St. *Cyprian* did not doubt in the leaſt, but that *Marcian* would be depoſed; for, in his Letter to *Stephen*, he deſired him to let him know the Name of the Perſon who ſhould be choſen in his room, that he may not be at a Loſs, to whom he ſhould direct his Letters.

Fauſtinus, and the other Biſhops of *Gaul*, did not apply, on this Occaſion, to *Stephen* alone, but to him, and to St. *Cyprian*. Why then ſhould their applying to the Biſhop of *Rome* be conſtrued, as it is, by all the *Roman Catholic* Writers, into a tacit Acknowledgement of his univerſal Juriſdiction, and not the like Conſtruction be put upon their applying to the Biſhop of *Carthage?* But, in Truth, neither can bear ſuch a Conſtruction, ſince the Biſhops of *Gaul* did not refer the Cauſe of *Marcian* either to *Stephen*, or to St. *Cyprian:* they wrote to both only for their Advice and Approbation. *Stephen* was backward, for Reaſons unknown to us, in giving his; and therefore St. *Cyprian*, in a Letter, which he wrote on this Occaſion, preſſed him to encourage with his Letters the People of *Arles*, and the Biſhops of *Gaul*, to depoſe *Marcian*, and appoint another in his room[d]. Was not this plainly acknowledging, not in the Biſhop of *Rome*, but in the People and Clergy, the Power of depoſing one Biſhop, and appointing another in his room?

But to return to *Stephen:* His raſh Conduct had involved the Churches of *Spain* in endleſs Calamities, had not St. *Cyprian*, and the other Biſhops of *Africa* zealouſly interpoſed. The Biſhops of *Spain*, having judged Two of their Collegues unworthy of the Epiſcopacy, *viz.* *Baſilides* of *Leon* and *Aſtorgy*, and *Martial* of *Merida*, had diſpoſed of their Sees to others,

Stephen's raſh Conduct.

[c] Cypr. ep. 67. [d] Idem ep. 70.

concluded, that he was actually depoſed; but that Liſt is very imperfect, the Names of many Biſhops being wanting there, whom we certainly know to have g'overned the Church.

others, appointing *Sabinus* in the room of the former, and *Felix* in that of the latter. They were both *Libellatici*, and guilty of many other Crimes, for which *Martial* had been depoſed; but *Baſilides*, returning to himſelf, and conſcious of his own Guilt, had voluntarily reſigned, delaring he ſhould think it a great Happineſs to be re-admitted, after due Satisfaction, to the Communion of the Church, even in the Capacity of a Layman. But, Ambition getting the better of all his good Reſolutions, he ſoon began to pant after his former Condition; and, thinking the Favour and Intereſt of the Biſhop of *Rome* might greatly contribute to his Re-eſtabliſhment, he undertook a Journey to that City; and there, as St. *Cyprian* expreſſeth himſelf, *impoſed upon our Collegue* Stephen, *who lived at a great Diſtance, and was ignorant of the Truth, ſeeking unjuſtly to be reſtored to his Biſhoprick, from which he had been juſtly depoſed*[e]. Being thus admitted to the Communion of the Biſhop of *Rome*, he returned well ſatisfied to *Spain*, and there exerciſed all epiſcopal Functions, as he had formerly done. St. *Cyprian* doth not tell us, in expreſs Terms, that *Martial* too had Recourſe to *Rome*; but that he had, may, perhaps, be gathered from his Words; for he writeth, that, notwithſtanding the Craft and Deceit *Martial* had uſed, probably in impoſing upon *Stephen*, he had not been able to preſerve his Epiſcopacy[f]. Beſides, he acted as a Biſhop after he had been depoſed by a Synod; which he would have hardly attempted, had he not been countenanced by ſome Biſhop of Rank and Dignity. Be that as it will, the Churches of *Leon*, *Aſtorga*, and *Merida*, applied, in this their Diſtreſs, to the Biſhops of *Africa*, imploring, both by Letters and Deputies, their Advice and Aſſiſtance. The Deputies were the Two new Biſhops *Felix* and *Sabinus*; and their Deputation was backed by a preſſing Letter from *Felix*, Biſhop

He ſuffereth himſelf to be impoſed upon.

[e] Cypr. ep. 68. [f] Idem ib.

Biſhop of *Saragoſa*, whom St. *Cyprian* ſtyleth a Propagator of the Faith, and Defender of the Truth [g]. Theſe Letters being read at *Carthage*, in a Council of 28 Biſhops, with St. *Cyprian* at their Head, it was concluded, that *Baſilides* and *Martial* ought not to be acknowledged as Biſhops; that it was not lawful to communicate with them; that ſuch Biſhops as did, ought to be excommunicated themſelves; and, finally, that their impoſing upon *Stephen*, inſtead of giving them any kind of Right to the Sees they had forfeited by their Wickedneſs, added to their Guilt. By the ſame Council, the Election of *Sabinus* and *Felix* was confirmed, and they acknowledged by all the *African* Biſhops as their Collegues [h].

Martial of Merida *excommunicated by the Biſhops of* Africa *though admitted by* Stephen *to his Communion.*

It is ſurprizing, that *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, *Davidius*, and other Advocates for the Pope's Supremacy, ſhould lay ſo much Streſs as they do, on the Recourſe to *Rome* of the Two depoſed Biſhops. If their recurring, or appealing, as they are pleaſed to ſtyle it, to the Biſhop of *Rome*, is any Proof of his being acknowledged by them for the Head of the Church, the Appeal of the other Biſhops of *Spain* from him to St. *Cyprian*, and their acquieſcing to his, and not to the Judgment of *Stephen*, will be a ſtronger Proof of St. *Cyprian*'s being acknowledged by them for the Head of the Church. Had *Baſilides* and *Martial* recurred not to *Rome*, but to *Carthage*, had the Biſhops of *Spain* appealed from St. *Cyprian* to *Stephen*, as they did from *Stephen* to St. *Cyprian*, and acquieſced to his Judgment, no Notice had been taken of the Appeal of the Two Apoſtates; that only of the Catholic Biſhops had been ſet forth with great Pomp and Flouriſh of Words. But, as the Caſe ſtandeth, they muſt be ſatisfied with the Evidence of the Apoſtates, and leave the Catholic Biſhops to bear Teſtimony for us, which we ſhall not miſuſe; we ſhall not build upon it the Supremacy of the Church of *Carthage*; we

Appeals to Rome, *no Proof of the Pope's Supremacy.*

[g] Cypr. ep. 68. [h] Idem. ib.

we ſhall not ſet up St. *Cyprian* for a Judge, to whoſe Tribunal all Appeals muſt be brought; in ſhort, we ſhall not make him an univerſal Judge, an univerſal Paſtor, a Pope; though to the Teſtimony of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, that of *Gregory Nazianzene* ſhould be added, and I defy the Champions for the See of *Rome*, to alledge one in their favour more plain and expreſſive: *St.* Cyprian, ſaith he, *preſided not only over the Church of* Carthage, *or that of* Africa, *on which he reflected an extraordinary Luſtre, but all over the Weſt, nay, and all over the Nations of the Eaſt, of the North, and the South*[i]. Had *Gregory* ſaid as much of the Biſhop of *Rome*, the Paſſage had been employed as a corner-ſtone to ſupport the Pope's univerſal Juriſdiction.

The famous Diſpute about the Baptiſm of Heretics.

Not long after the Affair of the *Spaniſh* Biſhops, that is, about the Year 256, according to the moſt probable Opinion, happened the famous Conteſt about the Baptiſm of Heretics, which rent the whole Church into Two Parties, the one headed by St. *Cyprian*, and the other by *Stephen*. St. *Cyprian* maintained, that Baptiſm, adminiſtered by Heretics, was null and invalid; and, conſequently, that ſuch as came over from them, from what Sect ſoever they came, ought to be baptized by a Catholic Miniſter: he owned there was but one Baptiſm, and therefore avoided the Word *Rebaptization*; but thought that Heretics had not the Power of conferring it. On the other Hand, *Stephen*, and thoſe who adhered to him, pretended, that Baptiſm conferred by Heretics, of whatever Sect or Perſuaſion, was valid; ſo that by avoiding one Error, they fell into another; for ſome Heretics of thoſe Times, namely, the *Montaniſts* and *Marcionites*, did not baptize, as is commanded by the Goſpel, in the Name of the Three Perſons; whence their Baptiſm was declared null by Two Oecumenical Councils, as I ſhall relate hereafter.

Both Opinions erroneous.

[i] Greg. Naz. orat. 18 p. 281.

ter. I know great Pains have been taken to excuſe *Stephen*; but his own Words, quoted by St. *Cyprian*, from his own Letter to him, can, in my Opinion, admit of no Diſpute; for he there forbiddeth, in expreſs Terms, the Baptizing of Heretics, *from what Hereſy ſoever they ſhould come*[k]. And here we may obſerve, by the way, that the whole Church erred, either at this Time, or afterwards; for afterwards both Opinions were condemned, and both were held at this Time, by the one or the other of the Two Parties, into which the whole Church was divided. The Point in diſpute had been canvaſſed long before, and differently ſettled in different Provinces. The Churches of *Africa* and *Numidia* had formerly admitted Heretics, without baptizing, or rebaptizing them; but the contrary Practice was eſtabliſhed in a Council of the Biſhops of theſe two Provinces, ſummoned about the Cloſe of the Second Century, by *Agrippinus* Biſhop of *Carthage*[l]. The ſame Practice of baptizing Heretics was followed by the Churches of *Cappadocia*, and the other Provinces of *Aſia*, as a Tradition handed down to them from the Apoſtles Times; whence it was confirmed in a Council, which was held at *Iconium* in *Phrygia*, about the Year 230, and conſiſted of all the Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, *Cilicia*, and the neighbouring Provinces[m]. The ſame Practice was approved of by another Council, aſſembled, much about the ſame time, at *Synnades* in *Phrygia*[n]. The Biſhops of *Pontus* and *Egypt* agreed, it ſeems, whith thoſe of *Cappadocia* and *Galatia*[o]; but all the other Biſhops, eſpecially thoſe of *Italy*, *Gaul*, and *Spain*, held the contrary Opinion, and followed the oppoſite Practice. This Diſagreement, both in Opinion and Practice, had hitherto created no Diſturbance in the Church, each Biſhop conforming to the Cuſtom of his particular Church, as received by Tradi-

The Cuſtom of baptizing Heretics, practiſed by ſeveral Churches, and eſtabliſhed by Council.

[k] Cyp. ep. 70, 73. [l] Idem. ib. Aug. bapt. l. 2. c. 7, et 8.
[m] Cypr. ep. 75. [n] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 7. [o] Baſil. ep. 75.

Tradition, or ſettled by Synods, without cenſuring thoſe who diſagreed with him, or being cenſured by them. But the Queſtion was now revived by Eighteen Biſhops of *Numidia*, who wrote to a Council, held at this time by St. *Cyprian*, to know whether they had done well in rebaptizing Heretics, agreeably to the antient Practice of their reſpective Churches. What raiſed this Doubt now we know not; but it is certain, the Council anſwered, that they ought to follow the Practice which they had hitherto obſerved [p]. The ſame anſwer was returned by St. *Cyprian* to *Quintus*, Biſhop of *Mauritania*, who had aſked the ſame Queſtion [q]. Soon after, another Council was held at *Carthage*, compoſed of 71 Biſhops, wherein the Decrees of the former Council, concerning the Baptiſm of Heretics, were confirmed; and beſides, it was ordained, that ſuch Preſbyters and Deacons as had received Ordination at the Hands of Heretics, or, after receiving Orders in the Church, had fallen into Hereſy, ſhould be admitted to Communion only as Laymen [r]. The Council, by a Synodal Letter, acquainted *Stephen* with theſe Reſolutions, hoping he would approve and embrace them; but, at the ſame time declaring, that, if any Biſhop ſhould think fit to reject them, and follow different opinions, agreeably to the Liberty they all claimed, no Breach of Peace and Unity ſhould thence follow on their Side [s]. With this Letter St. *Cyprian* ſent thoſe he had wrote to *Quintus*, and to the Biſhops of *Numidia* [t].

It is confirmed by Two Councils, held by St. Cyprian;

who acquainteth Stephen *with their Decrees.*

It was after this Council, and before *Stephen*'s Anſwer, that St. *Cyprian* wrote the famous Letter to *Jubaianus*, who was a Biſhop; but in what Province, or of what City, we know not. *Jubaianus* had, by a Letter, aſked St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion about the Baptizing of Heretics; and, at the ſame time, ſent him the Copy of a Letter, which he had received; wherein

St. Cyprian's *famous Letter to* Jubaianus.

[r] Cypr. ep. 70. [q] Idem ep. 71. [r] Idem. ep. 73. [s] Idem ep. 72. [t] Idem ib.

wherein many Reaſons were alleged to prove, that Baptiſm, by whomſoever adminiſtred, not even the *Marcionites* excepted, ought to be deemed valid. The Author of this Letter inveigheth bitterly againſt St. *Cyprian*, and thoſe of his Party, ſtyling them Betrayers of the Truth, and Enemies to the Peace and Unity of the Church [u]. *Baronius*, and likewiſe *Pamelius*, aſcribe that Piece to *Stephen*, not appriſed that they muſt conſequently own the Doctrine held by *Stephen* to have been no leſs erroneous than that which was held by St. *Cyprian*, if the Doctrine of the Church be true, as I have obſerved above. But we have not ſufficient Grounds to ſuppoſe *Stephen* the Author of it, ſince many beſides him wrote in favour of that Opinion. St. *Cyprian*, in Anſwer to *Jubaianus*, ſent him his Letter to *Quintus*, that of the firſt Council to the Biſhops of *Numidia*; and, moreover, wrote him a long Letter, with a great many Arguments in favour of his Opinion, and the Anſwers to what was objected againſt it, eſpecially in the Letter, whereof *Jubaianus* had tranſmitted him a Copy [w]. He endeth his Letter by a moſt ſolemn Proteſtation of Unity and Charity with thoſe who ſhould differ from him; which is related at Length by St. *Jerom* [x] and likewiſe by St. *Auſtin*, who telleth us, that he was never tired with reading over and over again thoſe Words of Peace and Charity, breathing nothing but the ſweeteſt Odour of that Union, in which the holy Prelate anxiouſly ſought to live with his Brethren [a]. To this Letter *Jubaianus* returned Anſwer, that he had fully convinced him, and that he willingly embraced his Opinion [b]. In that Letter St. *Cyprian* ſeemeth to have muſtered all the Arguments that could be alleged in favour of his Opinion; and therefore St. *Auſtin* hath employed his Third, Fourth and Fifth Book on Baptiſm, in confuting them.

His Deſire to live in Peace and Unity with thoſe who held the oppoſite Opinion.

We

[u] Cypr. ep. 73. [w] Idem ib. [x] Hier. in Luci. c. 9. [a] Aug. bapt. l. 4. c. 8. [b] Concil. p. 397.

Tradition, or ſettled by Synods, without cenſuring thoſe who diſagreed with him, or being cenſured by them. But the Queſtion was now revived by Eighteen Biſhops of *Numidia*, who wrote to a Council, held at this time by St. *Cyprian*, to know whether they had done well in rebaptizing Heretics, agreeably to the antient Practice of their reſpective Churches. What raiſed this Doubt now we know not; but it is certain, the Council anſwered, that they ought to follow the Practice which they had hitherto obſerved [p]. The ſame anſwer was returned by St. *Cyprian* to *Quintus*, Biſhop of *Mauritania*, who had aſked the ſame Queſtion [q]. Soon after, another Council was held at *Carthage*, compoſed of 71 Biſhops, wherein the Decrees of the former Council, concerning the Baptiſm of Heretics, were confirmed; and beſides, it was ordained, that ſuch Preſbyters and Deacons as had received Ordination at the Hands of Heretics, or, after receiving Orders in the Church, had fallen into Hereſy, ſhould be admitted to Communion only as Laymen [r]. The Council, by a Synodal Letter, acquainted *Stephen* with theſe Reſolutions, hoping he would approve and embrace them; but, at the ſame time declaring, that, if any Biſhop ſhould think fit to reject them, and follow different opinions, agreeably to the Liberty they all claimed, no Breach of Peace and Unity ſhould thence follow on their Side [s]. With this Letter St. *Cyprian* ſent thoſe he had wrote to *Quintus*, and to the Biſhops of *Numidia* [t].

It is confirmed by Two Councils, held by St. Cyprian;

who acquainteth Stephen *with their Decrees.*

St. Cyprian's *famous Letter to* Jubaianus.

It was after this Council, and before *Stephen*'s Anſwer, that St. *Cyprian* wrote the famous Letter to *Jubaianus*, who was a Biſhop; but in what Province, or of what City, we know not. *Jubaianus* had, by a Letter, aſked St. *Cyprian*'s Opinion about the Baptizing of Heretics; and, at the ſame time, ſent him the Copy of a Letter, which he had received; wherein

[p] Cypr. ep. 70. [q] Idem ep. 71. [r] Idem. ep. 73. [s] Idem ep. 72. [t] Idem ib.

wherein many Reaſons were alleged to prove, that Baptiſm, by whomſoever adminiſtred, not even the *Marcionites* excepted, ought to be deemed valid. The Author of this Letter inveigheth bitterly againſt St. *Cyprian*, and thoſe of his Party, ſtyling them Betrayers of the Truth, and Enemies to the Peace and Unity of the Church [u]. *Baronius*, and likewiſe *Pamelius*, aſcribe that Piece to *Stephen*, not appriſed that they muſt conſequently own the Doctrine held by *Stephen* to have been no leſs erroneous than that which was held by St. *Cyprian*, if the Doctrine of the Church be true, as I have obſerved above. But we have not ſufficient Grounds to ſuppoſe *Stephen* the Author of it, ſince many beſides him wrote in favour of that Opinion. St. *Cyprian*, in Anſwer to *Jubaianus*, ſent him his Letter to *Quintus*, that of the firſt Council to the Biſhops of *Numidia*; and, moreover, wrote him a long Letter, with a great many Arguments in favour of his Opinion, and the Anſwers to what was objected againſt it, eſpecially in the Letter, whereof *Jubaianus* had tranſmitted him a Copy [w]. He endeth his Letter by a moſt ſolemn Proteſtation of Unity and Charity with thoſe who ſhould differ from him; which is related at Length by St. *Jerom* [x] and likewiſe by St. *Auſtin*, who telleth us, that he was never tired with reading over and over again thoſe Words of Peace and Charity, breathing nothing but the ſweeteſt Odour of that Union, in which the holy Prelate anxiouſly ſought to live with his Brethren [a]. To this Letter *Jubaianus* returned Anſwer, that he had fully convinced him, and that he willingly embraced his Opinion [b]. In that Letter St. *Cyprian* ſeemeth to have muſtered all the Arguments that could be alleged in favour of his Opinion; and therefore St. *Auſtin* hath employed his Third, Fourth and Fifth Book on Baptiſm, in confuting them.

His Deſire to live in Peace and Unity with thoſe who held the oppoſite Opinion.

We

[u] Cypr. ep. 73. [w] Idem ib. [x] Hier. in Luci. c. 9. [a] Aug. bapt. l. 4. c. 8. [b] Concil. p. 397.

We have hitherto ſeen with how much Temper, Moderation, and Candor, the Diſpute was managed on St. *Cyprian*'s Side: he determined nothing without the Advice and Approbation of his Collegues aſſembled in Council; the Determinations of the Council he imparted to other Biſhops, leaving them at full Liberty to embrace or reject them, and declaring, that no Diſagreement in Opinion ſhould occaſion in him the leaſt Breach of Charity. How different was the Conduct of the Biſhop of *Rome!* He condeſcended, indeed, to anſwer the Synodal Letter of the *African* Biſhops; but did it with that Pride and Arrogance, that, in After-ages, became the Characteriſtic of his Succeſſors. He beginneth with the Dignity of his See, and his pretended Succeſſion to St. *Peter*, which he taketh care to put them in mind of: in the next Place, he rejecteth their Decrees with the utmoſt Indignation, and attempteth to confute the Arguments alleged to ſupport them: he then proceedeth to Commands and Menaces, ordering St. *Cyprian* to quit his Opinion, and threatening to cut off, from the Communion of the Church, all thoſe who ſhould preſume to differ from him, and rebaptize Heretics: he concludeth his Letter with a bitter Invective againſt St. *Cyprian*, branding that great Luminary of the Church with the reproachful Names of *falſe Chriſt*, *falſe Apoſtle*, *deceitful Workman*[c]. Such was Pope *Stephen*'s Anſwer to a moſt reſpectful Letter from a Council of 71 Biſhops. *Pompeius*, Biſhop of *Sabrata* in the *Tripolitana*, hearing of his Letter, and being deſirous to peruſe it, as he had done all the reſt, on the ſame Subject, St. *Cyprian*, in Compliance with his Deſire, ſent him a Copy of it; and at the ſame time wrote him a Letter, wherein he treateth *Stephen*, upon the juſt Provocation he had given him, with more than ordinary Sharpneſs and Acrimony, charging him with *Pride* and

Stephen's Pride and Arrogance.

He is ſeverely cenſured by St. Cyprian.

[c] Cyp. ep. 74. Euſeb. l. 7. c. 3. Aug. bapt. l. 2. c. 7.

and Impertinence, with *Self-contradiction and Ignorance*, with *Indiſcretion*, *Obſtinacy*, *Childiſhneſs*; nay, he ſtyleth him a *Favourer and Abettor of Heretics againſt the Church of God* [d]. St. *Cyprian* was more provoked at *Stephen*'s abuſive Language, than moved either by his Authority or Menaces. St. *Auſtin* ſuppoſeth the Opinion he held to have been falſe and erroneous; and yet owneth, that he was not obliged to yield to the Authority of *Stephen*, nor give up the Point, till he was convinced by dint of Reaſon, or by the Deciſion of an Oecumenical Council [e]. However, as St. *Cyprian* ſought nothing but Truth, upon the Receipt of *Stephen*'s Letter, he ſummoned a great Council, in order to have the Queſtion canvaſſed anew, and examined with more Care and Attention. The Council met accordingly, on the Firſt of *September* 256, conſiſting of 85 Biſhops, a great Number of Preſbyters and Deacons, and a conſiderable Part of the People. To this Aſſembly were read the Letter of *Jubaianus* to St. *Cyprian*, his Anſwer to it, and *Jubaianus*'s Reply; with the Letter of the former Council to *Stephen*, and *Stephen*'s Anſwer to the Council. Theſe Pieces being read, St. *Cyprian* made a ſhort Diſcourſe, exhorting his Collegues to ſpeak their mind freely: the Words he uſed on this Occaſion, alluded, without Doubt, to the Pride and Arrogance of the Biſhop of *Rome*; *Let none of us*, ſaith he, *ſet up for the Biſhop of Biſhops, let none of us preſume to reduce our Collegues by a tyrannical Fear to the Neceſſity of obeying:* he concluded with proteſting anew, in the moſt ſolemn manner, that he left every one the full Liberty of following what Opinion he liked beſt; and that no Man ſhould, on that ſcore, be judged by him, or ſeparated from his Communion [f]. The Diſcourſe being finiſhed, each Biſhop delivered

St. Cyprian aſſembleth a great Council at Carthage;

[d] Cyp. ep. 74. [e] Aug. de bapt. l. 1. c. 7. 18. et l. 2. c. 8. 15.
[f] Cyp. con. p. 397. [g] Idem ib. Aug. de bapt. l. 3. c. 3.

which confirmeth the antient Practice.

delivered his Opinion, and St. *Cyprian* the laſt, all approving, with one Conſent, the Baptizing of Heretics. *Pamelius* and others count 87 Biſhops preſent at the Council, becauſe *Natalis* of *Oea* ſpoke for the Two other Biſhops of *Libya Tripolitana*, viz. *Pompeius* of *Sabrata*, and *Dioga* of *Leptis the Great* [h], who were abſent.

The Third Council of *Carthage* having thus confirmed the Decrees of the Two former, notwithſtanding the Threats and Menaces of the Biſhop of *Rome*, it was thought adviſable, for the Peace of the Church, to acquaint him therewith; and, at the ſame time, to inform him more particularly of the Reaſons, on which their Opinion was grounded. Deputies were accordingly diſpatched to *Rome* for that Purpoſe; but *Stephen* not only refuſed to ſee or hear them, but would not allow any of his Flock to correſpond with them, to ſupply them with the Neceſſaries of Life, or even to admit them under the ſame Roof; excluding them not only from his Communion, but from common Hoſpitality, ſays *Firmilian*, who wrote this very Year [i]. He did not ſtop here; but, tranſported with Rage, or Zeal, as *Baronius* is pleaſed to ſtyle it, he cut off from his Communion all the Biſhops, who had aſſiſted at the Council, and all thoſe who held the ſame Opinion, that is, the Biſhops of *Africa*, *Numidia*, *Mauritania*, *Cilicia*, *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, and *Egypt* [k]. But *Stephen*'s Anathemas proved as thoſe of *Victor* had done before, *bruta fulmina*; no Regard was had to them, no, not even by thoſe of his own Party; who, by continuing in Communion with thoſe whom he had cut off from his, ſufficiently declared their Thoughts touching his raſh and unchriſtian Conduct. This Diſpute, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, occaſioned no Schiſm in the Church, the Biſhops continuing united in Charity, notwithſtanding their Diſ-

Deputies ſent to Stephen, *how treated.*

He excommunicateth all who held the oppoſite Opinion.

h Cypr. conc. p. 403. i Cypr. ep. 75. k Euſeb. l. 7. c. 5.

Diſagreement in Opinion [l]. No Thanks to *Stephen*, who did all that lay in his Power to ſet the Biſhops at Variance, and involve the whole Church in Confuſion and Diſorder: *The Peace of Chriſt*, continueth St. *Auſtin*, *triumphed in their Hearts, and put a Stop to the growing Schiſm*; not in the Heart of *Stephen*, where Rage, Ambition, and Envy lodged; Gueſts incompatible with Peace and Charity, but in the Hearts of the other Biſhops, who were thereby reſtrained from following his Example. How many Schiſms had been prevented, had Biſhops in After-ages trod in the Footſteps of thoſe great Prelates!

Dionyſius, afterwards Pope, and *Philemon*, both then Preſbyters of the Church of *Rome*, acquainted, no doubt, by *Stephen*'s Direction, the great *Dionyſius*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, with what had paſſed, hoping to gain him over to their Party, and extort from him an Approbation of *Stephen*'s Conduct: but that illuſtrious Prelate, foreſeeing, and well weighing, the evil Conſequences that might attend it, declared his Sentiments with all the Freedom and Zeal that became a Man of his Rank in the Church. He told them plainly, that the condemning of a Practice, which had been eſtabliſhed by ſo many Councils, was what he could by no means approve of; that an Affair of ſuch Conſequence required long and mature Deliberation; and that the deciding of it over-haſtily might raiſe eternal Diſputes, and end at laſt in Schiſm: he therefore begged *Stephen*, in a Letter, which he wrote to him on this Occaſion, that he would, upon Reflection, alter his Conduct; and, in an Affair upon which ſo much depended, take different Meaſures from thoſe which he had hitherto purſued [m]. As *Stephen* wrote to *Dionyſius*, ſo did St. *Cyprian* to *Firmilian*, giving him a particular and candid Account both of *Stephen*'s Conduct and his own. *Firmilian* was

Stephen's *Conduct diſ-approved by* Dionyſius *of* Alexandria;

[l] Aug. bapt. l. 5. c. 25. [m] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 5.

was Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, and one of the most eminent Prelates at that Time in the Church both for Piety and Learning: he had a singular Veneration for St. *Cyprian*, maintained with great Zeal the same Cause, and consequently had been equally ill used and excommunicated by *Stephen*. He therefore received with extraordinary Joy the Letter, which St. *Cyprian* sent him by *Rogatian* one of his Deacons, often read it with great Satisfaction [n], and answered it with a long Letter [o], which is still extant, though St. *Cyprian*'s to him hath been lost long since. In this Letter *Firmilian*, amazed and provoked at *Stephen*'s unaccountable Conduct, expresseth his Detestation of it in sharper Terms than the Laws of Charity can well allow; for, not content to charge him with sacrificing the Peace of the Church to a petulant Humour, he compareth him to *Judas*, and stigmatizeth him with the Epithets of inhuman, audacious, insolent, wicked, impious Schismatic; for *he is a true Schismatic*, says Firmilian, *who departeth from the Unity of the Church, which thou hast done*, O Stephen; *for, by attempting to separate others from thee, thou hast separated thyself from all other Churches! How much Sin hast thou heaped upon thyself by cutting thyself off from so many Flocks* [p]! *Firmilian*'s Letter was translated into *Latin* by St. *Cyprian* himself, as is manifest from the Style. It was unknown, it seemeth, to St. *Austin*; for he never quoteth it, nor, in confuting the Opinion of St. *Cyprian*, taketh any notice of some Reasons alleged in that Letter to support it.

and severely censured by Firmilian.

There was no Hope of seeing an End put to this Dispute, so long as *Stephen* lived; but he dying, his Successor, who was a Man of a quite different Temper, laid the Storm, which his furious and ungovernable Passion had raised. He died on the 2d of *August* 257, according to the most probable Opinion.

Stephen dieth, but not a Martyr.

[n] Cyp. ep. 75. [o] Cyp. ep. 75 [p] Idem ibid.

nion [q]. The Church of *Rome*, upon the Authority of his Acts, ranketh him among the Martyrs; but that Honour is not paid him either by St. *Auſtin*, or by *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, who, naming him together with St. *Cyprian*, as they often do, give conſtantly the Title of Martyr to the latter, and never to the former. As to his Acts, they flatly contradict, in ſeveral Points, the moſt unexceptionable Writers among the Antients [r]; and therefore by no means deſerve the Credit which *Baronius* would have us give them [s]. Even *Anaſtaſius* ſeemeth to have made no Account of them, if in his Time they were yet compoſed, which may be queſtioned; for the Account he giveth us of *Stephen*'s Death differeth widely from that which we read in thoſe Acts [t]. But he had made a bold Attempt towards extending the Power and Authority of the See of *Rome*, and therefore was to be placed among the Saints for the Encouragement of others. To ſay he had merited that Honour by his Virtues, either as a Chriſtian or a Biſhop, had been carrying the Impoſture too far: the only Means therefore left of making him a Saint, was to make him a Martyr, that, by his glorious Death, he might be thought to have deſerved what it was manifeſt from the Records of thoſe Times he had not deſerved by his Chriſtian Life. Hence Acts were forged, ſetting forth his heroic Confeſſion of the Faith before the Emperor, his Sufferings on that Account, the ſtupendous Miracles he wrought, *&c.* which, however incredible, might, in Proceſs of Time, by their Antiquity alone, gain Credit with the greater Part of Mankind. *Stephen* was buried in the Cœmetery of *Calliſtus* [u]; whence his Body was tranſlated about the Year 762, by *Paul* I. to a Monaſtery of *Greek* Monks, which that Pope had built in *Rome*, as we read in *Anaſta-*

His Acts fabulous.

His Reliques.

[q] Buch. cycl. p. 297. [r] Pearſ. annal. Cyp. p. 57, 58. [s] Bar. ad ann. 259. [t] Anaſt. in vit. Vict. [u] Buch. cycl. p. 267.

Anaſtaſius [w]. How it got from thence to *Trani* in *Apulia*, nobody knows; but from that City it was conveyed with great Pomp in 1682, to *Piſa* in *Tuſcany*, where it is ſtill worſhipped in a Church bearing the pretended Saint's Name [x]. According to the moſt probable Opinion, *Stephen* governed Four Years, and about Six Months.

VALERIAN, **SIXTUS II.** GALLIENUS.

Twenty-third BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 257.

STEPHEN being dead, *Sixtus*, or *Xyſtus* II. a Deacon of the Church of *Rome*, was choſen to ſucceed him. As the late Diſpute was not yet ended, *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* no ſooner heard of his Promotion, than he began to preſs him with great Earneſtneſs to relinquiſh the wild Pretenſions of his Predeceſſor, and concur with the other Biſhops in reſtoring Peace and Tranquillity to the Church [y]. He wrote Three Letters to him on the ſame Subject, whereof the laſt was from *Dionyſius* and the whole Church of *Alexandria*, to *Sixtus* and the whole Church of *Rome* [z]. He wrote likewiſe to *Dionyſius* and *Philemon*, two Preſbyters of the Church of *Rome*, whom we have mentioned above, and who, upon *Stephen*'s Death, ſeem to have abandoned his Party; for *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria*, in his firſt Letter to *Sixtus*, writes, That theſe two Preſbyters had been formerly of *Stephen*'s Opinion [a], a plain Indication that they were not then. The Biſhop of *Alexandria* had at laſt the Satisfaction to ſee his pious Endeavours crowned with Succeſs; for we find no farther Mention made of this Diſpute till it was revived by the *Dona-*

Dionyſius of Alexandria interpoſeth in the famous Diſpute.

Peace reſtored to the Church by his means.

[w] Anaſt. c. 95. [x] Boll. Pont. p. 36. [y] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 5. 9.
[z] Idem c. 9. [a] Idem c. 5.

Donatiſts. In what Manner it ended we are nowhere told; but it is manifeſt from the Writers of thoſe Times, that the *African* and *Aſiatic* Biſhops continued the ſame Practice of baptizing Heretics, till it was condemned by the two great Councils, of *Arles* in 314, and of *Nice* in 325 [b]. Whence we may well conclude, that the Terms propoſed at the Beginning of the Diſpute by *Dionyſius* and St. *Cyprian*, were agreed to by *Sixtus*, *viz.* That no Reſtraint ſhould be laid on the Biſhops of either Side, but that every one ſhould be allowed to follow undiſturbed which of the two Opinions he thought moſt agreeable to the Scripture and to Reaſon. This was allowing the Biſhops to conſult the Scriptures, and make uſe of their own Reaſon. But the Succeſſors of *Sixtus* have not been ſo complaiſant; for they pretend, that a blind Faith ought to be yielded to all their Deciſions as infallibly true, a blind Obedience to all their Decrees as unqueſtionably holy.

But now the Perſecution, which had begun ſome Months before the Deceaſe of *Stephen*, raged with more Violence than ever: For *Valerian* having, at the Inſtigation of an *Egyptian* Magician, changed the Kindneſs he once had for the Chriſtians, into an implacable Hatred, he ordered, by a Reſcript to the Senate, all Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, to be carefully ſought for, and executed without Mercy [c]. Purſuant to this Order, *Sixtus*, who, among the firſt, fell into the Hands of the Perſecutors, was immediately either beheaded, as we read in the Pontifical of *Bucherius* [d]; or crucified, as we are told by *Prudentius* [e]; having held the Chair only Eleven Months, and ſome Days. *Pontius*, a Deacon of the Church of *Carthage*, ſtyleth him a good and *pacific Prelate* [f], no doubt on account of his Conduct quite oppoſite to

Valerian *perſecutes the Church.*

Sixtus *martyred.*

[b] Cyp. ep. 77. Baſil. can 47. et ep. 8. conc. Arel, can. 8. [c] Cyp. ep. 82. [d] Buch. p. 268. [e] Prud. de coron. martyr. p. 71. [f] Pont. in vit. St. Cyp. p. 8.

to that of his ambitious and quarrelſome Predeceſſor (A).

GALLIENUS, DIONYSIUS, CLAUDIUS II.

Twenty-fourth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt. 258. *The See vacant almoſt a whole Year.*

SIXTUS being dead, and the Chriſtians prevented by the Perſecution from aſſembling to chooſe another in his room, the See remained vacant almoſt a whole Year, that is, from the 6th of *Auguſt* 258 to the 22d of *July* 259, when *Dionyſius*, a Preſbyter of the Church of *Rome*, whom we have mentioned above, was elected, to the great Satisfaction of the Faithful; for he was one of the moſt eminent Men of his Time both for Piety and Learning g. During his Pontificate, the *Goths* broke into the Empire, over-ran all *Aſia Minor*, and, having almoſt utterly deſtroyed the City of *Cæſarea*, they carried with them into Captivity moſt of its Chriſtian Inhabitants.

g Baſil. ep. 220. et de Spir. Sanct. c. 29. Euſeb. l. 7. c. 7. Athan. de ſyn. ep. 918.

(A) *Ruffinus* publiſhed, under the Name of *Sixtus* Biſhop of *Rome*, the Book of a *Pythagorean* Philoſopher, named *Sixtus*. St. *Jerom* reproacheth him in two Places with that *Impoſture*, as he ſtyleth it, ſuppoſing him to have known the Work, which he aſcribed to Pope *Sixtus*, not to be his (1). St. *Auſtin* was impoſed upon among the reſt; for, in his Treatiſe of *Nature and Grace*, he quoteth that Book as the Work of Pope *Sixtus*, but he afterwards owned and corrected his Miſtake (2). It was ranked by Pope *Gelaſius* among the Books of Heretics; ſo that he ſuppoſed it to have been written by a Chriſtian; which was more than he could know, there not being a ſingle Word in it whence he can argue the Author to have believed in, or to have had any Knowlege of Chriſt: and it is on this Conſideration that it hath been thought unworthy of a Biſhop of thoſe Times.

(1) Ep. ad Cteſiph. contr. Pelag. c. 22. et in cap. 18. Ezech.
(2) Aug. l. 2. retract. c. 42.

bitants. *Firmilian* was then Biſhop of the Place, who had cenſured the Conduct of *Stephen* with ſo much Sharpneſs and Acrimony; but the Remembrance of what had paſſed on that unhappy Occaſion had not that Effect on *Dionyſius*, which far leſs Provocations have had on many of his Succeſſors; for he no ſooner heard of the Diſtreſs that Church was in, than, laying hold of ſo favourable an Opportunity to exert his Charity, he wrote a Letter to comfort them in their Calamity, and at the ſame time diſpatched proper Perſons with large Collections to ranſom the Chriſtians who had fallen into the Hands of the *Barbarians*[h]. The Letter, which *Dionyſius* wrote on this Occaſion, was carefully kept in the Archives of the Church of *Cæſarea*, as an authentic Monument of his Goodneſs and Charity[i]. The great *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, having, at this Time, compoſed a learned Treatiſe to prove againſt *Sabellius* the Diſtinction of the Divine Perſons, ſome over-zealous Catholics, miſconſtruing ſeveral Pages in that Work, and concluding that he had run into the oppoſite Error, accuſed him to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as if he denied the Son to be conſubſtantial with the Father[k]. Hereupon the Biſhop of *Rome*, having aſſembled a Council, acquainted *Dionyſius* with the Sentiments of the other Biſhops, and his own, expreſſing his Concern, that the Divinity of the Word ſhould have been queſtioned by him, and at the ſame time deſiring him to anſwer the Accuſation[l]. This *Dionyſius* readily did in Four Books, which he ſtyled *Confutation and Apology*; ſhewing therein that his Opinion was very different from what it had been repreſented at *Rome*, and explaining thoſe Paſſages which had given Ground for the Accuſation. This Work he addreſſed to the Biſhop of *Rome*[m]. Here *Baro-*

Dionyſius's *Charity to the diſtreſſed Chriſtians of* Cæſarea.

Dionyſius *of* Alexandria *accuſed at* Rome.

[h] Baſil. ib. [i] Idem ib. [k] Athan. pro ſent. Dion. Alex. p. 558. [l] Idem ibid. et de ſyn. 918, 919. [m] Athan. ibid. p. 558, 559.

Baronius exults. Behold, ſaith he, one of the moſt eminent Prelates of the Church, upon Suſpicion of Hereſy, arraigned at *Rome*, judged at *Rome*. Who doth not ſee a ſupreme Tribunal erected there, to which all Cauſes muſt be brought; a ſovereign Judge reſiding there, by whom all Perſons muſt be abſolved or condemned; is either blind and cannot ſee, or ſhuts his Eyes and will not ſee [n]. And doth not the ſharp-ſighted Annaliſt himſelf ſee what every one the leaſt converſant in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory muſt ſee, if he is not either blind and cannot, or ſhutteth his Eyes and will not ſee, *viz.* Biſhops, when guilty, or only ſuſpected of Hereſy, accuſed to ſome of their Collegues, who neither had nor claimed any Juriſdiction over them? Thus was the famous *Paul* of *Samoſata*, Biſhop of *Antioch*, at this very Time, accuſed by his whole Church, firſt to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and ſoon after to *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* [o]. That ſuch an Indictment argued any Juriſdiction in thoſe Biſhops over the Biſhop of *Antioch*, is what *Baronius* himſelf dareth not affirm; and yet a like Indictment brought to *Rome* is enough for him to transform that See into a ſupreme Tribunal; that Biſhop, though far from ſuch ambitious Thoughts, into a ſovereign Judge. But the Biſhop of *Rome*, ſaith *Baronius*, required of *Dionyſius* a Confeſſion or Declaration of his Faith: And doth not that argue Superiority and Juriſdiction? *Baronius* himſelf knew it doth not: for it is impoſſible he ſhould not know, that when a Biſhop was ſuſpected of Hereſy, all his Collegues had a Right to require of him a Confeſſion of his Faith, and not to communicate with him till they had received it.

That argueth no Juriſdiction in the Biſhop of Rome *over him.*

In the Time of *Dionyſius* was held the famous Council of *Antioch*, which condemned and depoſed *Paul* Biſhop of that City, who denied the Diſtinction of the Divine Perſons, and the Divinity of *Chriſt*. Of the

Paul *Biſhop of* Antioch *condemned and depoſed.*

[n] Bar. ann. 263. n. 50. [o] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 27.

the Depoſition of *Paul*, and the Election of *Damnus*, who was placed in his room, notice was immediately given to the whole Church, by a Synodal Letter addreſſed to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and to *Maximus*, who had ſucceeded the great *Dionyſius* in the See of *Alexandria* [p]. And here it will not be foreign to my Purpoſe to obſerve, that the Biſhop of *Antioch* was ſummoned to appear before the Council, and not at the ſupreme Tribunal erected by *Baronius* at *Rome*; that he was condemned and depoſed without the Conſent or Concurrence, nay, and without the Knowlege of the ſovereign Judge reſiding at *Rome*; that he did not appeal to him, which he certainly would have done, as he was a Man of unparallelled Impudence and Ambition, had ſuch a Cuſtom obtained in thoſe Days; and laſtly, that the Fathers of the Council wrote to the Biſhop of *Rome* in the ſame manner as they did to other Biſhops, letting him know, that for the future he was to communicate with *Damnus*, and not with *Paul*. All this is manifeſt from the Account which St. *Baſil* giveth us of that Council [q]. And yet *Baronius* bringeth in that Father, even on this Occaſion, as an Evidence for the Papal Supremacy (A).

without the Conſent or Knowledge of the Biſhop of Rome.

From

[p] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 30. [q] Baſil de ſynod.

(A) For by wrong pointing a Paſſage in the *Latin* Tranſlation of that Author, he maketh him contradict himſelf, and aſcribe the depoſing of *Paul* to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and the Great *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, though the latter was dead before *Paul* was depoſed, as is evident from the Letter which was written by the Council on that Occaſion, and is addreſſed to *Maximus* the Succeſſor of *Dionyſius* in the See of *Alexandria* (1). The Paſſage runneth thus; *Duo enim* Dionyſii *diu ante eos ſeptuaginta fuere, qui* Samoſatenſem *ſuſtulere, quorum alter* Romæ, *alter* Alexandriæ *Præſul erat* (2). The Meaning of St. *Baſil* is, that the two *Dionyſius*'s flouriſhed before the Council of *Antioch*, which conſiſted of Seventy Biſhops, and depoſed *Paul* of *Samoſata*; that is, before the Second Council that was aſſembled againſt him; for another had been convened in the ſame City about eight

(1) Euſeb. l. 7. c. 30. (2) Baſil. de ſyn. p. 918.

From St. *Baſil*, *Baronius* runneth to the Emperor *Aurelian*, begging of a Pagan Prince what he could not extort from a Catholic Biſhop, a Declaration and Acknowlegement of the Pope's Supremacy. The Reader muſt know, that *Paul* having kept, by Force, Poſſeſſion of the Biſhop's Habitation in Defiance of the Council, the Catholic Biſhops had Recourſe to the Emperor, who, after hearing both Parties with great Attention, adjudged the Houſe to him, who ſhould be acknowleged by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the other Biſhops of *Italy*[r]. This *Baronius* interpreteth as an open Acknowlegement of the Pope's Supremacy; and that his Readers may not overlook it, as moſt of them would be apt to do, he taketh care to beſpeak their Attention, by marking it in the Margin with the following Words in Capitals, *The Emperor* Aurelian *acknowlegeth the Supremacy of the Church of* Rome[s]. From this one would expect to find *Aurelian* not only turned Chriſtian, but proſtrate at his Holineſs's Feet, and bowing down to kiſs them: but our Annaliſt, to the great Diſappointment of his Readers, after having thus raiſed their Attention, only repeateth out of *Euſebius* the Sentence

Paul keepeth Poſſeſſion of the Biſhop's Habitation.

[r] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 24. [s] Bar. ad ann. 272. n. 18.

eight Years before to depoſe him; but upon his pretending to renounce his Errors, the Sentence had been ſuſpended. The above-quoted Paſſage *Baronius* ſtoppeth thus; *Duo enim* Dionyſii *dix ante eos ſeptuaginta fuere; qui* Samoſatenſem *depoſuere*, &c. ſo that the Relative *qui* referreth, according to this Method of Pointing, to the two *Dionyſius's*, and not to the Seventy Biſhops; as if St. *Baſil* had ſaid, *The two* Dionyſius's, *who depoſed* Paul *of* Samoſata, *flouriſhed before the Council of* Antioch, *which was compoſed of Seventy Biſhops* (3). So that *Paul* muſt be twice depoſed, St. *Baſil* muſt contradict himſelf, all the Writers of thoſe Times muſt be arraigned as guilty of an unpardonable Omiſſion, leſt the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould appear to have been, what he really was, an idle Spectator of a Tranſaction ſo famous in the Hiſtory of the Church. A Writer of any Honour or Honeſty had rather give up a Cauſe, than expoſe himſelf thus by attempting to defend it.

(3) Bar. ad ann. 265. n. 10.

tence pronounced by the Emperor, which he would have us ſuppoſe with him to have been owing to the Knowlege that Prince had of the Pope's Supremacy. And why muſt the Pope's Supremacy be brought in here rather than the Supremacy of the Biſhops of *Ravenna*, of *Milan*, of *Aquileia*, &c. and, above all, the Supremacy of the collective Body of the *Italian* Biſhops? for to them, and not to any particular Biſhop, the Cauſe was referred by the Emperor. As for the Emperor's Conduct on this Occaſion, it may be thus accounted for: That juſt and wiſe Prince obſerved the Biſhops in the Eaſt greatly animated againſt *Paul*; and therefore apprehending them more ſwayed by Paſſion and Prejudice than by Juſtice and Equity, he referred the Cauſe to the Biſhops of *Italy*, who he thought would judge more impartially, as being placed at a Diſtance, and not engaged, at leaſt not ſo warmly, in the Diſpute [t]. But this happened two Years after the Death of *Dionyſius*; for he died on the 26th of *December* 269, *Claudius* and *Paternus* being Conſuls, after having governed the Church of *Rome* for the Space of Ten Years, Five Months, and Four Days, according to the moſt probable Opinion [u]. As he died in the Reign of *Claudius* II. ſurnamed *the Gothic*, who is repreſented in the Acts of ſome pretended Martyrs as an implacable Enemy to the Chriſtian Name, he is in ſome Martyrologies honoured with the Title of Martyr; but as neither *Euſebius*, nor any other antient Writer, taketh notice of that Prince's having ever perſecuted or moleſted the Chriſtians, thoſe Acts ought to be looked upon as fabulous, and *Dionyſius* with 375 more expunged out of the Catalogue of Martyrs; though ſome of them, namely *Marcus*, *Priſcus*, *Valentine*, and *Quirinus*, are honoured by the Church of *Rome*, as Saints of the firſt Claſs,

The Emperor's Sentence whether favourable to the Pretenſions of the See of Rome.

Dionyſius dieth,

not a Martyr.

[t] Vide Du Pin de antiq. eccl. diſcip. diſſert. 2. p. 156. [u] Buch. p. 272.

Class, and have filled with their Reliques most of the Provinces of *Europe*.

CLAUDIUS II. **FELIX,** AURELIAN.

Twenty-fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 269.

DIONYSIUS was succeeded by *Felix*, in whose Time a furious Persecution being raised by *Aurelian*, he may be supposed to have suffered among the rest, since he is distinguished by the Council of *Ephesus*[a], by St. *Cyril*[b], and by *Vincentius Lirinensis*[c], with the Title of Martyr. He presided, according to *Eusebius*[d], *Syncellus*[e], and *Eutychius*[f], Five Years, to which *Baronius* addeth Eleven Months, and Twenty-five Days[g]. He wrote a Letter addressed to *Maximus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, which is quoted by *Cyril*, and the Council of *Ephesus*[h]. The Acts of the Martyrs, who are supposed to have suffered under *Aurelian*, are without all doubt supposititious; for in them frequent mention is made of the Emperor's Son, whereas the Writers of those Times tell us in express Terms, that he had a Daughter, but no Male Issue[i].

Felix dieth a Martyr in the Persecution of Aurelian.

AURELIAN, TACITUS, **EUTYCHIANUS,** PROBUS, CARUS.

Twenty-sixth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 275.

FELIX being dead, *Eutychianus* was chosen in his room in the very Beginning of the Year 275[k]. Several Things are said of him by *Anastasius*, and

[a] Conc. t. 3. p. 511. [b] Cyr. ib. [c] Vin. Lirin. c. 42.
[d] Euseb. l. 7. c. 32. [e] Sync. p. 385. [f] Eutych. p. 400.
[g] Buch. 272. [h] Conc. t. 3. p. 511, 851. [i] Aur. vit. p. 223.
[k] Euseb. l. 7. c. 32. Buch. p. 272.

and other Writers of no Authority; but all I can learn of the Antients concerning him, is, that he governed Eight Years, and Eleven Months[l]; and conſequently died in the Cloſe of the Year 283. He is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Martyr, and ſaid in the *Roman* Martyrology to have ſuffered under *Numerian*; but it is certain that in 283, when *Eutychianus* died, *Numerian* was not Emperor, but only *Cæſar*, and at that very Time engaged with his Father *Carus* in a War with the *Perſians* in the Eaſt, where he was aſſaſſinated by *Aper* his Father-in-Law. As for his Brother *Carinus*, who remained in the Weſt, neither he, nor the two preceding Emperors, *Tacitus* and *Probus*, ever gave the leaſt Diſturbance to the Chriſtians; ſo that the Church of *Rome* muſt be at the Trouble of finding out a diſtinct Place in Heaven from that of the Martyrs for *Eutychianus*, *Trophimus*, *Sabbacius*, and the illuſtrious Senator *Dorymedon*, who are ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under thoſe Princes.

Felix not martyred.

CARUS, CARINUS, NUMERIAN,

CAIUS,

DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN.

Twenty-ſeventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

AS little is ſaid by the Antients of *Caius* as is ſaid of his Predeceſſor. A few Days after the Death of *Eutychianus*, *Caius* was choſen to ſucceed him, *Carus* and *Carinus* being Conſuls[m]. He preſided Twelve Years, Four Months, and Seven Days; that is, from the 17th of *December* 283, to the 22d of *April* 296. *Caius* too is counted by the Church of *Rome* among the Martyrs, upon the Authority of *Bede*, and the Acts of St. *Suſanna*, by which that Writer ſeemeth to have been miſled. In thoſe Acts *Caius*

Year of Chriſt 283.

Caius not a Martyr, though honoured as a Martyr.

[l] Buch. p. 272. [m] Idem ibid.

Claſs, and have filled with their Reliques moſt of the Provinces of *Europe*.

CLAUDIUS II. **FELIX,** AURELIAN.

Twenty-fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 269.

DIONYSIUS was ſucceeded by *Felix*, in whoſe Time a furious Perſecution being raiſed by *Aurelian*, he may be ſuppoſed to have ſuffered among the reſt, ſince he is diſtinguiſhed by the Council of *Epheſus*[a], by St. *Cyril*[b], and by *Vincentius Lirinenſis*[c], with the Title of Martyr. He preſided, according to *Euſebius*[d], *Syncellus*[e], and *Eutychius*[f], Five Years, to which *Baronius* addeth Eleven Months, and Twenty-five Days[g]. He wrote a Letter addreſſed to *Maximus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, which is quoted by *Cyril*, and the Council of *Epheſus*[h]. The Acts of the Martyrs, who are ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under *Aurelian*, are without all doubt ſuppoſititious; for in them frequent mention is made of the Emperor's Son, whereas the Writers of thoſe Times tell us in expreſs Terms, that he had a Daughter, but no Male Iſſue[i].

Felix dieth a Martyr in the Perſecution of Aurelian.

AURELIAN, TACITUS, **EUTYCHIANUS,** PROBUS, CARUS.

Twenty-ſixth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 275.

FELIX being dead, *Eutychianus* was choſen in his room in the very Beginning of the Year 275[k]. Several Things are ſaid of him by *Anaſtaſius*, and

[a] Conc. t. 3. p. 511. [b] Cyr. ib. [c] Vin. Lirin. c. 42.
[d] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 32. [e] Sync. p. 385. [f] Eutych. p. 400.
[g] Buch. 272. [h] Conc. t. 3. p. 511, 851. [i] Aur. vit. p. 223.
[k] Euſeb. l. 7. c. 32. Buch. p. 272.

and other Writers of no Authority; but all I can learn of the Antients concerning him, is, that he governed Eight Years, and Eleven Months[l]; and conſequently died in the Cloſe of the Year 283. He is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Martyr, and ſaid in the *Roman* Martyrology to have ſuffered under *Numerian*; but it is certain that in 283, when *Eutychianus* died, *Numerian* was not Emperor, but only *Cæſar*, and at that very Time engaged with his Father *Carus* in a War with the *Perſians* in the Eaſt, where he was aſſaſſinated by *Aper* his Father-in-Law. As for his Brother *Carinus*, who remained in the Weſt, neither he, nor the two preceding Emperors, *Tacitus* and *Probus*, ever gave the leaſt Diſturbance to the Chriſtians; ſo that the Church of *Rome* muſt be at the Trouble of finding out a diſtinct Place in Heaven from that of the Martyrs for *Eutychianus*, *Trophimus*, *Sabbacius*, and the illuſtrious Senator *Dorymedon*, who are ſuppoſed to have ſuffered under thoſe Princes.

Felix *not martyred.*

CARUS, CARINUS, NUMERIAN,

CAIUS,

DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN.

Twenty-ſeventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

AS little is ſaid by the Antients of *Caius* as is ſaid of his Predeceſſor. A few Days after the Death of *Eutychianus*, *Caius* was choſen to ſucceed him, *Carus* and *Carinus* being Conſuls[m]. He preſided Twelve Years, Four Months, and Seven Days; that is, from the 17th of *December* 283, to the 22d of *April* 296. *Caius* too is counted by the Church of *Rome* among the Martyrs, upon the Authority of *Bede*, and the Acts of St. *Suſanna*, by which that Writer ſeemeth to have been miſled. In thoſe Acts *Caius*

Year of Chriſt 283.

Caius *not a Martyr, though honoured as a Martyr.*

[l] Buch. p. 272. [m] Idem ibid.

Caius is ſaid to have ſuffered with *Suſanna* his Niece, and many others under *Numerian*, but that Prince, in his Father's Life-time, had no great Power, being only *Cæſar*, and very young, and was killed on his March out of *Perſia*, ſoon after his Father's Death; ſo that he never reigned in the Weſt, and but a very ſhort time in the Eaſt. *Caius* therefore could not ſuffer under him at *Rome*, where his elder Brother *Carinus* governed. But the Vulgar have a particular Veneration for Martyrs, and, what turneth to a very good Account, are glad to purchaſe their Reliques at any rate. The Church of *Rome* therefore, to provide herſelf with great Store of them, hath multiplied beyond Belief the Number of her Martyrs; which ſhe could not well do without multiplying at the ſame time the Number of the Perſecutors of the Chriſtian Religion. And hence it is, that ſeveral Princes, who never moleſted, nay, who greatly favoured the Chriſtians, have been by the Church of *Rome* transformed in her Martyrologies and Legends into Perſecutors. As for the Acts of the ſuppoſed St. *Suſanna*, they are full of Miſtakes and Abſurdities, and contradict the beſt Hiſtorians of thoſe Times.

The Church of Rome, *why ſo fond of Martyrs.*

DIOCLESIAN, MAXIMIAN, **MARCELLINUS**, CONSTANTIUS, GALERIUS.

Twenty-eighth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 296.

MARCELLINUS ſucceeded *Caius* on the 30th of *June* 296, and governed Eight Years, Three Months, and Twenty-five Days, according to the moſt ancient Records[n]: ſo that he muſt have died on the 24th of *October* 304. The Love of Truth, which an Hiſtorian ought never to ſwerve from, obligeth me to undertake the Defence of this Pope

Marcellinus unjuſtly aſperſed by the Church of Rome.

[n] Buch. cycl. p. 272.

Pope againſt the Church of *Rome* herſelf, and moſt of her Divines, who, joining the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, have endeavoured to blacken his Memory with Aſperſions equally wicked and groundleſs. For the Church of *Rome* telleth us, both in her Breviary and Martyrology, and her Divines muſt chime in with her, that *Marcellinus* being apprehended during the Perſecution of *Diocleſian*, he was perſuaded by that Prince to deliver up the Holy Scripture to be burnt by the Pagans, agreeably to a late Edict, and at the ſame time to offer Incenſe to the Gods. This they found on the Acts of the Council of *Sinueſſa*, which is ſuppoſed to have been ſummoned on that Occaſion, and before which *Marcellinus* is ſaid to have been convicted by Seventy-two Witneſſes of the above-mentioned Crimes. That ſuch a ſcandalous Story, invented by the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, as St. *Auſtin* affirmeth [k], ſhould not only have been credited, but induſtriouſly propagated, by the Succeſſors of *Marcellinus*, muſt ſeem very ſtrange and ſurpriſeing to thoſe, who recollect with how much Zeal they have ſtrove, on other Occaſions, to conceal or excuſe the leaſt Imperfections in their Predeceſſors. If therefore they not only readily own the Apoſtaſy of *Marcellinus*, but are the firſt to divulge it, and take care to make it known in the Breviary to thoſe who ſcarce know any thing elſe, we may be well aſſured there is a Snake hid in the Graſs; the more as it is certain almoſt beyond doubt, that no ſuch Council was ever held; and conſequently that the Acts, upon which alone that Apoſtaſy is founded, are ſuppoſititious. To unravel the Whole, the Reader muſt know, that the Fall of *Marcellinus* made ſuch a Noiſe in the Church, as we read in thoſe Acts, that immediately a grand Council met, compoſed of no fewer than 300 Biſhops. Before this Council *Marcellinus* appeared; but, at his firſt Appearance, the Biſhops, ſtruck with Horror at the very Thought

[k] Aug. de bapt. c. 10.

of judging the Head of the Church, the Judge of all, cried out with one Voice, *The first See is to be judged by no-body: accuse yourself, judge yourself, condemn yourself.* To this Testimony, so favourable to the ambitious Views of the Bishops of *Rome*, is intirely owing the Sanction which they have given to such Fables, highly injurious to the Memory of one of their best Predecessors. Without this Lenitive, the Acts of the pretended Council of *Sinuessa*, supposing the Apostasy of a Pope, had been condemned; the Absurdities and Contradictions, which it is wholly made up of, had been set forth in a proper Light; and the Testimonies of *Theodoret* and St. *Austin* had been alleged to vindicate the Character of *Marcellinus*: for of these two Writers the former telleth us, that he acquired great Glory by his Conduct during the Persecution[l]; and the latter, in writing against *Petilian* the *Donatist*, has the following Words: *Why should I answer the Calumnies with which he loads the Bishops of* Rome? *Why should I clear them from the Crimes which he layeth to their Charge?* Marcellinus, *and his Presbyters* Melchiades, Marcellus, *and* Sylvester, *are accused by him as if they had delivered up the sacred Books, and offered Incense to the Gods: Are they therefore to be thought guilty? Doth he prove what he advanceth against them? He brands them with the Epithets of wicked and sacrilegious; but I say they are innocent: And why should I produce Reasons to support my Defence, since he bringeth none to make good his Charge*[m]? But a solemn Declaration, that *the See of* Rome *is to be judged by no-body*, made in those early Times, by 300 Bishops, carrieth with it such Marks of Truth, as quite invalidate the Testimonies of *Theodoret* and St. *Austin*, and render the Apostasy of *Marcellinus*, which gave room to that Declaration, undeniable. St. *Austin* looketh upon the

Their View therein.

Marcellinus *commended and vindicated by the Antients.*

[l] Theod. l. 1. c. 2. p. 524.

[m] Aug. in Pet. c. 16. t. 7. p. 87.

the Apoſtaſy of *Marcellinus*, and his Preſbyters *Melchiades*, *Marcellus*, and *Sylveſter*, who were all afterwards Biſhops of *Rome*, as a mere Calumny, as an Invention of the *Donatiſts*; but their Succeſſors trampling upon all Authority that ſtandeth in the Way of their Ambition, chuſe rather to have Four of their Predeceſſors thought Apoſtates and Idolaters, than part with the Decree of that pretended Council, exalting them ſo high above all other Biſhops.

If *Marcellinus* acquired great Glory during the Perſecution, as *Theodoret* aſſureth us; if his Apoſtaſy was a mere Calumny, broached by the *Donatiſts*, as we read in St. *Auſtin*; the pretended Council of *Sinueſſa* muſt be given up, ſince it is ſuppoſed to have been aſſembled on occaſion of *Marcellinus*'s Fall: but, abſtracting from the Fall of *Marcellinus*, the Circumſtances attending that Council are in themſelves ſo abſurd and incredible, that there needeth no other Argument to convince a Man, who hath any Underſtanding, and dareth to uſe it, that no ſuch Council ever was, or could be held. For who can conceive it poſſible, that, during the moſt cruel Perſecution the Church ever ſuffered, 300 Biſhops ſhould aſſemble, not in *Rome*, where they might more eaſily have met unobſerved, but in a ſmall Country Town, where a much leſs numerous Aſſembly muſt immediately have been obſerved and ſuſpected? But, after the Death of *Fabianus*, ſaith *Baronius*[n], the Clergy of *Rome*, and the Biſhops, met to chuſe him a Succeſſor, notwithſtanding the Perſecution that raged then. He ought to have ſaid *ſome Biſhops*, as St. *Cyprian* doth[o], whom he quoteth; but I ſhall ſay ſo for him, that his Argument may appear in its full Strength, and ſave me the Trouble of anſwering it; for it will then run thus: Some Biſhops, perhaps 15 or 20, met unobſerved in the great and populous City of *Rome*: *Ergo*, 300 might meet

The Acts of the Council of Sinueſſa *ſabulous.*

No ſuch Council ever held.

[n] Bar. ad ann. 303. n. 102, 105. [o] Cyp. ep. 31.

meet unobſerved in a ſmall Country Town; for ſuch was *Sinueſſa*.

The many Abſurdities contained in the Acts of that Council.

This Council is ſuppoſed to have been held in a Grotto, or Cave, where there was no room but for 50 at a time; and yet they are all ſaid to have been preſent when *Marcellinus* owned his Crime, and diveſted himſelf of his Dignity. And what a deſpicable Figure doth he make on that Occaſion! At firſt he denies the Charge; but, being convicted by 72 Eye-witneſſes, he owneth it at laſt, but in Terms more becoming a School-boy trembling at the Sight of a Rod, than a penitent Biſhop, before ſo grave an Aſſembly. But the moſt remarkable Paſſage in that Piece is the Diſpute between *Urbanus* High Pontiff of *Jupiter*, and *Marcellinus* High Pontiff of the Chriſtians. *Urbanus*, to convince his Fellow-Pontiff that he ought not to ſcruple offering Incenſe to *Jupiter*, alleges the Example of the Mages offering Incenſe to *Chriſt*. *Marcellinus* anſwers, That the offering of Incenſe on that Occaſion was myſterious; and unravels the Myſtery. Hereupon *Urbanus*, unacquainted with Myſteries, appealeth to the Judgment of the Emperors *Diocleſian* and *Maximian*; to this Appeal *Marcellinus* agreeth; and the Controverſy is referred by both *Pontiffs* to be decided by the Two Emperors. They, no doubt, gave Sentence in favour of *Jupiter* and *Urbanus*; and then *Diocleſian*, taking *Marcellinus* with him into the Temple of *Veſta*, perſuaded him there to offer Incenſe to *Jupiter*, *Hercules*, and *Saturn*. How theſe Three Deities came to have a Place in the Temple of *Veſta*, the Compiler of theſe Acts alone knoweth. Such are the Abſurdities and Contradictions, of which that Piece is wholly made up. But it flatters the Ambition of the Succeſſors of *Marcellinus*; on occaſion of his Fall it exalts the See of *Rome* above all other Sees: its Authority therefore muſt not be called in queſtion: all the Abſurdities and Contradictions it containeth, muſt be blindly believed; the Memory of *Marcelli-*

nus

nus moſt unjuſtly ſlandered; the Teſtimonies of *Theodoret* and St. *Auſtin*, clearing him from all Guilt, diſregarded and rejected. And may not this be interpreted as a tacit Declaration, that they had rather he had been guilty than innocent, provided his Guilt could any-ways contribute to the Aggrandizing of their See? What can we think their Ambition will ſpare, ſince they have thus ſacrificed to it the Character of one of their Predeceſſors, whoſe Memory is revered by all Antiquity? The Church of *Rome* honoureth *Marcellinus* as a Saint; and, notwithſtanding his pretended Apoſtaſy, alloweth him a Place among her Martyrs; probably by way of Reparation for the Injuſtice done him. But his Martyrdom may be juſtly queſtioned; at leaſt it ſeemeth to have been utterly unknown to St. *Auſtin*, who flouriſhed not long after his Time, ſince he never mentioneth it, although it would have afforded him the ſtrongeſt Argument he could poſſibly uſe to ſilence the *Donatiſts*. His Martyrdom, it is true, is vouched by *Bede*, who telleth us, that he was beheaded at *Rome*, by *Dioclefian*'s Order; but that Hiſtorian is often led into groſs Miſtakes by a Pontifical, ſuppoſed to have been written in the Sixth Century, which he frequently copieth, with all its Anachroniſms, and other Faults.

Marcellinus falſly ſuppoſed to have died a Martyr.

That, upon the Death of *Marcellinus*, there happened a Vacancy of ſome Years, ſeemeth undeniable, ſince it is marked in the Pontificals, even in that of *Bucherius* [p], and mentioned by all thoſe who, until *Baronius*'s Time, have wrote the Hiſtory of the Popes: but what at this time ſhould occaſion a Vacancy at leaſt of Three Years, is what I will not take upon me to account for: the Perſecution laſted but Two Years in *Italy*, according to *Euſebius* [q], which expired ſoon after the Death of *Marcellinus*: ſome pretend that it raged there ſo long as *Galerius* was Maſter of that Country. Be that as it will, it is certain,

Vacancy of Three Years.

[p] Buch. p. 272. [q] Euſeb. l. 8. c. 14.

certain, that *Maxentius* usurped the Empire in 306, and that he not only favoured the Christians, but pretended to be of the same Religion himself; and yet the See remained vacant, according to the Pontifical of *Bucherius*[r], until the Tenth Consulate of *Maximian Hercules*, and the Seventh of *Maximian Galerius*, that is, until the Year 308. *Baronius* indeed admitteth of no Vacancy; but, in Opposition to all those who have wrote before him, places the Election of *Marcellus* immediately after the Decease of his Predecessor *Marcellinus*[s]. This I should readily agree to, but for the Authority of the abovementioned Pontifical, which had not yet appeared in *Baronius*'s Time, and is thought to have been written about the Year 354. As for the Chronicle of *Eusebius*, it can be here of no Weight on the one Side or the other, since *Marcellus* is there quite left out; and his Successor *Melchiades* is said to have died before *Constantine* made himself Master of *Rome*; whereas it is certain, that, under *Melchiades*, a Council was held at *Rome*, by that Prince's Order, as we shall see hereafter.

MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, **MARCELLUS**, GALERIUS, CONSTANTINE.

Twenty-ninth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 308.

UPON the Death of *Marcellinus*, the See remained vacant somewhat above Three Years and an Half; that is, from the 24th of *October* 304, to the 19th of *May* 308, when *Marcellus* was chosen in his room. Thus says the Pontifical of *Bucherius*, where, instead of Seven Years, which is a Mistake of the Transcribers, as is manifest from the Consulships marked there, we must read Three[t]. The Similitude of the Two Names hath misled some Writers

Marcellinus and Marcellus confounded by some Writers;

[r] Buch. ib. [s] Bar. ad ann. 304. n. [t] Buch. p. 272.

Writers to confound *Marcellinus* with *Marcellus*; for *Euſebius*, as well as St. *Jerom*, only mention the former; and *Theodoret*, omitting both *Marcellus* and *Euſebius*, who ſucceeded him, named *Melchiades* as the immediate Succeſſor of *Marcellinus* [u]; which hath made Dr. *Pearſon* doubt, whether *Marcellus* was ever Biſhop of *Rome* [w]. But *Marcellinus* and *Marcellus* are evidently diſtinguiſhed in the Pontifical of *Bucherius*, by the different Times, in which they governed, and the different Conſuls, under whom their Government began and ended [x]. They are, beſides, diſtinguiſhed both by *Optatus Milevitanus* [y], and St. *Auſtin* [z], who ſpeaketh of *Marcellus*, not only as a Preſbyter of the Church of *Rome*, but as Biſhop of that See. To theſe Teſtimonies I may add the Epitaph of *Marcellus* by Pope *Damaſus*, ſuppoſing him to have been Biſhop of *Rome* [a]. *Damaſus* flouriſhed about the Year 366. Many things are ſaid of *Marcellus*; but they are all founded either on his Acts, or the modern Pontificals, and conſequently have no Foundation at all. Pope *Damaſus*, in his Epitaph, telleth us, that his Steadineſs in keeping up the Diſcipline of the Church, and obliging ſuch as had fallen, during the Perſecution, to give due Satisfaction, ſtirred up againſt him a general Hatred, which, not confined to private Diſputes and Invectives, ended in Tumults, Bloodſhed, and Murders [b]. *Damaſus* adds, that *the Crime of one, who had renounced the Faith, while the Church enjoyed a profound Peace, induced the Tyrant* Maxentius *to ſend* Marcellinus *into Baniſhment*. But of theſe Tranſactions the Antients either have not thought fit to give us a more particular Account, or, if they did, their Writings have not reached our Times. *Marcellus* died on the 16th of *January* 310, having held the Pontificate One Year, Seven Months, and Twenty

but diſtinguiſhed by others.

Marcellus *is baniſhed.*

[u] Theod. l. 1. c. 2. [w] Pearſ. poſt. 109. [x] Buch. p. 272.
[y] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [z] Aug. ep. 165. & in Petil. c. 16. p. 87.
[a] Vide Bolland. 16. Jan. p. 5. [b] Bar. add. 309.

ty Days [c]; but whether he died in Baniſhment, or was recalled to *Rome*, is uncertain. The Church of *Rome*, upon the Authority of his fabulous Acts, hath added him with many others, to the Number of her Martyrs: but *Maxentius*, who reigned at *Rome*, during his Pontificate, and under whom he is ſaid to have ſuffered, had no ſooner made himſelf Maſter of that City, than he put an End to the Perſecution, as we are told, in expreſs Terms, by *Euſebius* [d]. He is ſaid to have been buried in the Cœmetery of *Priſcilla*, on the *Salarian* Way [e]; but his Body, like the Bodies of moſt other Saints, is now worſhipped in ſeveral Places; *viz.* in a Church, bearing his Name, at *Rome*; in the Abbey of *Omont* in *Hainaut*, not far from *Maubeuge*; at *Cluni*, in a Pariſh-Church of the Dioceſe of *Elne* in *Rouſſillon* [f], &c.

His Acts are fabulous.

His Reliques.

CONSTANTINE, **EUSEBIUS,** LICINIUS.

Thirtieth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 310.

MARCELLUS was ſucceeded by *Euſebius* who governed Seven Months, according to *Euſebius* [g], but only Four Months and Sixteen Days, according to the Pontifical of *Bucherius* [h]. From an antient Epitaph on this Pope, we learn, that he oppoſed, with great Vigour and Zeal, one *Heraclius*, pretending that thoſe who had fallen during the Perſecution, ought to be readmitted to the Communion of the Church, without giving ſuch Satisfaction as was then required; and that hereupon great Diviſions happening among the People, *Maxentius*, to put an End to thoſe Diſturbances, baniſhed *Euſebius* into *Sicily* [i]. Many other things are ſaid of him by *Anaſtaſius*, *Platina*, *Ciacconius*, and ſuch-like Writers; but what we

Stands up in Defence of the Diſcipline of the Church, and is baniſhed.

[c] Buch. p. 272. [d] Euſeb. l. 8. c. 14. [e] Boll. Jan. 16. p. 5. [f] Idem, & Flor. in Martyr. Hier. p. 256, 257. [g] Euſeb. chron. [h] Buch. p. 272. [i] Bar. ad ann. 311.

we read in them hath no better Foundation than what is advanced by *Baronius*; *viz.* that he inſtructed *Euſebius*, the celebrated Biſhop of *Vercelli*, and gave him his own Name[k]; which is founded on the Acts of that Biſhop, now univerſally rejected as ſuppoſititious.

CONSTANTINE, MELCHIADES, LICINIUS.

Thirty-firſt BISHOP *of* Rome.

MELCHIADES, or *Miltiades*, as he is called in the antient Manuſcripts, was choſen to ſucceed *Euſebius*, on the 2d of *July* 311, after a Vacancy of Nine Months, and upwards[l]; which Hiſtorians do not account for. In his Time happened the ever memorable Converſion of *Conſtantine* to the Chriſtian Religion. That Prince, having overcome and utterly defeated the Uſurper *Maxentius*, on the 28th of *October* 312, ſoon after iſſued an Edict, jointly with *Licinius*, who was upon the Point of marrying his Siſter, allowing the Chriſtians the free Exerciſe of their Religion, and likewiſe the Liberty of building Churches[m]. By the ſame Edict he ordered the Places, where they had held their Aſſemblies before the Perſecution, and which had been taken from them, to be reſtored[n]. He left *Rome* in the Beginning of the Year 313, and, arriving at *Milan*, he there iſſued a ſecond Edict, to correct ſome Miſtakes that had given Offence in the former[o]. What theſe Miſtakes were, we know not; for the Decree itſelf hath not reached our Times; but *Valeſius* conjectures, that the high Commendations beſtowed on the Chriſtian Religion alarmed the Pagans, imagining,

Year of Chriſt 311.

Conſtantine *converted to the Chriſtian Religion.* *His Edicts in favour of the Chriſtians.*

[k] Bar. ad ann. n. 42. [l] Buch. p. 272. [m] Euſeb. l. 9. c. 9. [n] Idem, l. 10. c. 5. [o] Idem ib.

imagining, that the Intention of the Two Princes was to ſuppreſs theirs; and likewiſe, that ſome Chriſtians had taken Offence at the odious Name of Heretics, given, in that Decree, to the various Sects ſprung from them [p]. Be that as it will, it is certain, that, by the Second Decree, an intire Liberty of Conſcience was granted to all ſorts of Perſons, every one being allowed to honour and worſhip what Deity he pleaſed, and in what manner ſoever he thought beſt. The Second Edict ſtrictly injoineth all thoſe, who had purchaſed of the Exchequer, or held by Grant, any Place formerly deſtined for the Aſſemblies of the Chriſtians, to reſtore them forthwith, and apply to the Exchequer; where they ſhould be indemnified [q]. The ſame Year 313, *Licinius*, having gained a complete Victory over *Maximinus*, a ſworn Enemy to the Chriſtians, made himſelf Maſter of *Nicomedia*, and there cauſed the Edict of *Milan* to be proclaimed, and ſet up in the Market-place, on the 13th of *June* [r]. Thus Peace was reſtored to the Church, in the Eaſt as well as in the Weſt, after a moſt cruel and bloody Perſecution of Ten Years, and almoſt Four Months; for the Firſt Edict againſt the Chriſtians had been publiſhed in that very City on the 24th of *February* 303 [s].

The Schiſm of the Donatiſts *in* Africa.

Another remarkable Incident of this Pontificate was the famous Schiſm, formed in *Africa* againſt *Cæcilianus*, the Catholic Biſhop of *Carthage*; whereof a ſuccinct Account will not be foreign to my Subject, as *Melchiades* was chiefly concerned in moſt of the Tranſactions relating to it. The Firſt Decree againſt the Chriſtians, publiſhed by *Dioclefian*, which I have juſt now mentioned, ordered the Churches to be every-where laid level with the Ground, the Books of the Scripture to be carefully ſought for, and publicly burnt; and that ſuch Perſons of Quality as ſhould

[p] Val. in not. ad Euſeb hiſt. p. 195. [q] Euſeb. ib. [r] Lact. perſc. 47, 48. [s] Idem ib.

ſhould perſiſt in the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, ſhould be deemed infamous, and excluded from all Honours and Employments. This Edict was executed with ſuch Rigour in *Africa*, that it was a capital Crime in the Magiſtrates of the Cities, and puniſhable with Death, to ſhew any Mercy or Compaſſion to a Chriſtian, who, owning he had the ſacred Books, ſhould refuſe to deliver them into the Hands of the proper Officers. Thoſe who, in Compliance with this Edict, delivered them up, which great Numbers did, were ſtyled *Traditores*, a Name, which afterwards became famous in the Hiſtory of the Church, by affording the *Donatiſts* a plauſible Pretence to ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of the Catholick Biſhops [t]. Of this Crime *Menſurius*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, was falſly accuſed; but, although the Charge could not be proved againſt him, yet ſome of his Flock, encouraged by *Donatus*, Biſhop of *Caſænigræ* in *Numidia*, ſeparated from his Communion [u]. *Menſurius* dying ſome Years after, *Cæcilianus*, Deacon of the Church of *Carthage*, was choſen in his room, in Spite of the Cabals and Intrigues of *Botrus* and *Cæleſius*, Two chief Preſbyters, who aſpired to that Dignity. *Cæcilianus*, ſoon after his Election, ſummoned ſome Perſons, in whoſe Cuſtody his Predeceſſor had left the Money of the Church, to deliver it up to him: but they not only refuſed to comply with his Demand, but began to ſtir up the People, and form a Party againſt him. *Botrus* and *Cæleſius* were not idle on this Occaſion, but, animated with Jealouſy and Envy, left no Art unpractiſed to blacken his Character, and diſcredit him with thoſe who had preferred him to them. But the chief Support of this Faction was *Lucilla*, a Woman of great Quality, Wealth, and Intereſt, and an avowed Enemy to *Cæcilianus*, who, while he was yet Deacon, had

Traditores, who.

The chief Authors of the Schiſm againſt Cæcilianus.

[t] Aug. l. 7. c. 2. Opt. l. 1. p. 39. [u] Aug. col'at Carth. die 3. c. 12. Valeſ. in not. ad Euſeb. hiſt. p. 191.

had publicly reprimanded her for kiſſing the Relique of a Martyr, as ſhe was upon the Point of receiving the Euchariſt. An undeniable Proof, that the Worſhip of Reliques was at this time diſapproved by the Church. Such Liberty, taken with a Perſon of her Rank, was what ſhe could not brook; and therefore ſhe laid hold of the firſt Opportunity that offered, and no better could offer, to revenge the Affront [w]. It is not to be doubted but thoſe, who had ſeparated from *Menſurius*, joined this Faction, ſince the Second Schiſm owed its Origin to the Firſt, as St. *Auſtin* ſaith, ſpeaking of the Two Schiſms under *Menſurius* and *Cæcilianus* [x].

The Biſhops of Numidia *ſummoned to depoſe him.*

The Schiſmatics, to give an Appearance of Juſtice and Authority to their Proceedings, ſummoned *Secundus* Biſhop of *Tigiſis*, and the other Biſhops of *Numidia*, to depoſe *Cæcilianus*, and chuſe another in his room; for the Biſhops of *Numidia* claimed the Privilege of aſſiſting at the Election of the Biſhop of *Carthage*, and ordaining him after he was elected [y]. They readily complied with the Summons; but, upon their Arrival, they found, to their great Surprize, that the whole City, except a ſmall Number of Schiſmatics, the avowed Enemies of *Cæcilianus*, communicated with him as their lawful Biſhop [z]. They were 70 in Number, but as many of them were *Traditores*, and ſome guilty of other enormous Crimes, as appeareth from the Acts of the Council of *Cirtha* [a], they were eaſily prevailed upon by *Lucilla*, who is ſaid to have ſpent an immenſe Sum on this Occaſion [b], to declare the Election of *Cæcilianus* void, and the See of *Carthage* vacant. The only thing they could lay to his Charge was, that he had been

They declare his Election null.

[w] Opt. l. 1. p. 41. Aug. Pſal. Abced. p. 3. in Petil. c. 18. & contr. epiſt. Parmen. p. 7. [x] Aug. coll. Carth. die 3. c. 12. [y] Aug. in Par. l. 1. c. 3. & Pſal. Abced. p. 3. Opt. p. 41. [z] Opt. ib. [a] Aug. in Creſc. l. 3. c. 26, 27, 29. & coll. die 3. c. 17. die 2. c. 14, &c. [b] Aug. in Gaud. l. 1. c. 37. ep. 162. & in Pſal. 36. p. 119.

been ordained by *Felix* Biſhop of *Aptungus*, whom they falſly accuſed as a *Traditor*. *Cæcilianus* refuſed to appear before them; and truly, to truſt himſelf to ſuch an Aſſembly, had been acting a very imprudent Part; for *Purpurius*, Biſhop of *Limata*, had ſaid, *If he cometh among us, inſtead of laying our Hands upon him, by way of Ordination, we ought to knock out his Brains, by way of Penance* [a].

The Schiſmatics ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of the Church.

The Party having thus declared *Cæcilianus* illegally elected and ordained, they ſeparated themſelves from his Communion, and from the Communion of all who communicated with him [b]; that is, from the Communion of the Catholic Church; for *Cæcilianus* was acknowleged by the other Biſhops of *Africa*, by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and by all the Biſhops of the World, ſaith St. *Auſtin* [c]. Such was the Riſe of the famous Schiſm, which for the Space of 300 Years, and upwards, occaſioned great Diſturbances in the Churches of *Africa*. *Donatus*, Biſhop of *Caſænigræ* in *Numidia*, was the firſt Author of it, according to St. *Auſtin* [d]; but it was not from him, but from *Donatus*, the Schiſmatic Biſhop of *Carthage*, that they took the Name of *Donatiſts*; for, until his Time, they ſtyled themſelves the Party of *Majorinus* [e], whom they choſe and ordained Biſhop of *Carthage*, in the room of *Cæcilianus*; although he was then only Lector of that Church, and had been formerly one of *Lucilla*'s menial Servants [f]. To juſtify their Conduct, and their electing of a new Biſhop, they wrote Letters to all the Churches of *Africa*, filled with Calumnies againſt *Cæcilianus*, and thoſe who had ordained him. By theſe Letters great Numbers were impoſed upon, and miſled; inſomuch that, the People being every-where divided, moſt Churches had Two Biſhops, the one ordained by *Majorinus*, and the other by *Cæcilianus* [g].

Called Donatiſts, *and from whom.*

About

[a] Opt. p. 41. [b] Aug. coll. die 3. c. 14. [c] Idem ep. 162.
[d] In Joann. evang. tract. 69. p. 12. [e] Hier. vir. ill. c. 93.
[f] Opt. l. 1. p 42. [g] Aug. ep. 162.

Edicts enacted by Conſtantine, *in favour of the Chriſtian Religion.*

About this time, that is, about the Year 313, *Conſtantine*, out of his Zeal for the Chriſtian Religion, iſſued Two Decrees, addreſſed to *Anulinus*, Proconſul of *Africa*, the one commanding all the Places in that Province to be reſtored, which had once belonged to the Catholic Church, and might have been uſurped during the Perſecution [h]; and the other, exempting the Eccleſiaſtics from all civil Functions [i]. This Privilege was granted only to the Eccleſiaſtics of the Catholic Church, whereof *Cæcilianus* was the Head, as was expreſly declared in the Edict, and therefore to him alone the Proconſul imparted it. It was a great Mortification to the *Donatiſts* to ſee themſelves thus diſregarded by the Emperor: they therefore aſſembled a few Days after, and, drawing up a Petition to *Conſtantine*, they delivered it, unſealed, to *Anulinus*, together with a Bundle of Papers, ſealed up in a Leather Bag, with this Title: *The Petition of the Catholic Church, containing the Crimes of* Cæcilianus; *by the Party of* Majorinus. The Subſtance of the Petition was, that the Controverſy between them and the other Biſhops of *Africa* might be referred to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, who were free from the Imputation of having delivered up the ſacred Books to the Pagans [k]. *Anulinus* immediately diſpatched a Meſſenger to the Emperor, both with the Requeſt, and the Papers, giving him, at the ſame time, by a Letter ſtill extant [l], an Inſight into the Diſpute, that made ſo great a Noiſe in *Africa*. *Conſtantine*, who was then in *Gaul*, having received and read all thoſe Pieces, expreſſed great Concern to find the Chriſtians thus divided among themſelves, and the Biſhops at Variance with one another [m]. However, he readily granted to the *Donatiſts* the Judges they demanded, naming, for that

The Donatiſts *petition* Conſtantine, *that the Diſpute may be referred to the Biſhops of* Gaul.

[h] Euſeb. l. 10. c. 5. [i] Idem ib. c. 7. & Cod. Theod. 16. t 2. l. 1. p. 20. [k] Aug. ep. 68. Valeſ. in not. ad hiſt. Euſeb. p. 197. [l] Coll. Carth. in concil. per Steph. Baluz. c. 3. n. 216, 220. p. 578. [m] Opt. l. 1. p. 44.

that Purpoſe, *Maternus* Biſhop of *Cologne*, *Rheticius* Biſhop of *Autun*, and *Marinus* Biſhop of *Arles* [n]; all Men of known Integrity, great Learning, and unblemiſhed Characters. To theſe, by a Letter under his own Hand, he gave Notice of their new Commiſſion; and, at the ſame time, for their better Information, he cauſed Copies to be tranſmitted to them, of all the Papers he had received from *Anulinus* [o]. The Three Biſhops were ordered to repair, with all Speed, to *Rome*, and there, jointly with *Melchiades*, Biſhop of that City, to ſit as Judges of the Controverſy. *Cæcilianus* likewiſe was ordered to *Rome*, and allowed to take with him Ten Biſhops of his Party, ſuch as he ſhould judge the moſt capable of defending his Cauſe; and the ſame Liberty was granted to the adverſe Party [p]. *Conſtantine*, in the Letter he wrote on this Occaſion to *Melchiades*, after appealing to him as a Witneſs of the Reſpect and Veneration he had for the Catholic Church, declareth, he had nothing ſo much at Heart as to ſee her Members happily united: he therefore earneſtly intreateth him to examine the Affair with the utmoſt Attention, and, jointly with the Biſhops of *Gaul*, to judge it according to the ſtricteſt Laws of Juſtice and Equity [q]. In this Letter *Conſtantine* nameth no other Judges but the Three Biſhops of *Gaul*, *Melchiades*, and one *Mark*, ſuppoſed to have been Biſhop of *Milan*, whom he joineth with *Melchiades*; but afterwards he ordered Seven more to be added to the Number, and as many as could ſoon and conveniently aſſemble; ſo that they are at laſt 19 in all [r]. They met, for the firſt time, on *Friday* the Second of *October* 313. *Conſtantine* and *Licinius* being the third time Conſuls [s]. The Place they met in was the Apartment of *Fauſta*, in the *Lateran* Palace [t], ſhe being then

The Biſhops named by Conſtantine.

His Letter to Melchiades.

The Council of Rome.

[n] Opt. ib. Aug. ep. 166. Carth. p. 149. Carth. die 3. c. 17. Opt. ib.
[o] Euſeb. l. 10. c. 5.
[q] Euſeb. ib.
[r] Opt. l. 1. p. 44.
[s] Coll. Aug. coll.
[t] Opt. ib.

then in all Likelihood, absent in *Gaul*, with the Emperor her Husband. Before this Assembly *Cæcilianus* appeared as the Person accused, and *Donatus*, of *Casænigræ*, as the Accuser. They had but Three Meetings: in the First, the Characters of the Accusers and Witnesses were strictly inquired into, and their Depositions heard; in the Second, the Acts of the Council of *Carthage*, which had condemned *Cæcilianus*, as I have related above, were examined; and in the last, *Cæcilianus* against whom nothing had been proved, was absolved, and *Donatus* condemned as a Slanderer, and the chief Author of the Schism [u], An Account of the Whole, together with the Acts of the Council, was immediately transmitted to *Constantine*, who began to flatter himself, that he had put an End to the Dispute; for he could not imagine, that the *Donatists* would appeal from the Judgment of such unexceptionable Judges, of Judges whom they themselves had demanded. But the good Prince was yet a Stranger to the Nature of religious Disputes, to the Heat, Animosity, and enthusiastic Rancour, with which they are commonly carried on. Notwithstanding the Pains he took, and his Successors after him, and no Pains they spared to heal these unhappy Divisions, they continued, to the great Scandal of the Pagans, rending the Church into most furious Parties and Factions, for the Space of near 300 Years. The Council of *Rome* was held in the Month of *October* 313, and *Melchiades* died on the Tenth of *January* ensuing, *Volusianus* and *Anienus* being Consuls, having presided for the Space of Two Years Six Months, and Eight Days [w]. About an hundred Years after, the *Donatists* charged him with having delivered up the sacred Books, and offered Incense to the Pagan Gods; but this St. *Austin* calleth a groundless Charge, a mere Calumny, a malicious Invention of the *Donatists* of his Time to justify the Conduct of their Predecessors, in appealing,

Cæcilianus *absolved and* Donatus *condemned.*

Melchiades *dies.*

[u] Coll. Carth. p. 149. & ep. 162. Opt. ib. [w] Buch. p. 272.

pealing, as they did, from the Council of *Rome*, at which *Melchiades* aſſiſted, and robably preſided, as Biſhop of the Imperial City [x].

Baronius, impatient to ſee the Pope raiſed to the Rank of a Prince, endeavoureth to prove, that *Melchiades* was placed in that Station by *Conſtantine* and argues thus: The Council of *Rome* was held in the *Lateran* Palace; therefore that Palace had been given by *Conſtantine* to *Melchiades*, and belonged to him; for that an Aſſembly of Nineteen Biſhops only ſhould meet in ſo ſpacious a Palace, can no otherwiſe be accounted for, but by ſuppoſing the Pope to have reſided there. This he calleth a Demonſtration [y]. Having thus got him a Palace, and, no doubt, magnificently furniſhed, he findeth no Difficulty in equipping him in every other reſpect as a Prince: For who can imagine, ſaith he, that *Conſtantine*, ſo pious, ſo generous a Prince, would have given to the Head of the Church a Royal Palace to live in, and not allow him at the ſame time a ſuitable Retinue, with ſuitable Appointments? To act otherwiſe, had not been honouring, but diſgracing the Chriſtian Religion, ſince its High Pontiff, ſtalking about all alone in a huge Palace, could be but an Object of Ridicule to the Pontiffs of the Pagan Superſtition, who lived in magnificent Houſes, with anſwerable Grandeur [z]. Thus is the Biſhop metamorphoſed at once into a Sovereign. But the Metamorphoſis is ſomewhat premature. If *Conſtantine*, yet a *Neophyte*, was not well acquainted with the true Spirit of the Chriſtian Religion, *Melchiades* was; and therefore, had that Prince offered to diſtinguiſh him by any ſuch Marks of worldly Grandeur, I do not queſtion but, as he was a very good Man, he would have taken from thence an Opportunity of inſtructing him better

Whether the Lateran *Palace was given by* Conſtantine *to* Melchiades.

[x] Aug. in Pet. p. 87. & in Par. c. 5. p. 8. [y] Bar. ad ann. 312. n. 82. [z] Id. ib n. 85.

better in the Principles of his new Profeſſion, and ſhewing him in what Contempt the Chriſtian Prelates had, and he himſelf ought to have, all worldly Grandeur. But no ſuch offer was ever made or dreamt of: For what at length is all this founded on? On the Meeting of the Council in the *Lateran* Palace. The *French* Academy meet in the *Louvre:* Are they therefore Princes? And doth not *Optatus*, of whom we have the whole Account, call it in expreſs Terms the Houſe of *Fauſta*[a]? *Fauſta* perhaps lived there, ſaith *Baronius*, during the long and flouriſhing Reign of her Father *Maximian*, and thence it might be called the Houſe of *Fauſta*. Thus in the End is the Demonſtration dwindled away to a mere Conjecture, and a very groundleſs one too: But, waving that, why might not *Fauſta* continue in the ſame Palace after her Father's Death, with her Huſband *Conſtantine*, when he was at *Rome*, or alone, when ſhe did not attend him in the Wars? The Annaliſt ſeemeth to have forgot, that *Fauſta* was *Conſtantine*'s Wife. But, after all, the Empreſs, as it appeareth to me, had only an Apartment in the *Lateran*; for in this Senſe I underſtand *Optatus* ſaying, *The Council was held in the Houſe*, or *Habitation, of* Fauſta *in the* Lateran: But her being any ways there excludeth *Melchiades*. Their ſitting in the Imperial Palace gave a kind of Authority and Sanction to their Deciſions; and beſides, there might not be room in the Houſe of *Melchiades*, if he had a Houſe, for the Council, and thoſe who were to attend it, they being in all Forty Biſhops; ſo that we need not put *Melchiades* in Poſſeſſion of that Palace, to account for the Council's meeting in it, as *Baronius* hath done.

[a] Opt. l. 1. p. 44.

SYLVESTER,

CONSTANTINE, **SYLVESTER,**

Thirty-second BISHOP *of* Rome.

SYLVESTER was chosen in the room of *Melchiades* on the last of *January* 314[b]. In his time were held the two great Councils of *Arles* and *Nice*. The former was convened by *Constantine*'s Order, at the Request of the *Donatists*, who, instead of acquiescing to the Judgment of the Council of *Rome*, loudly complained to the Emperor of the Bishops, who composed it, as partial, prejudiced, and over-hasty in deciding a Controversy of the greatest Importance[c]. *Constantine* heard them with great Patience; and that he might leave them no Colour or Pretence whatsoever to continue in their Schism, he summoned a second Council to meet at *Arles*, inviting several Bishops to it, with most pathetic Letters under his own Hand, and ordering the Proconsuls and Governors of Provinces to acquaint the rest with his Desire and Intention. *Chrestus*, or *Crescentius*, Bishop of *Syracuse*, was allowed, and so, without all doubt, were the rest, to bring two Presbyters with him, and three Attendants, as we learn from the Emperor's Letter to him, which is still extant[d]. They were all to be supplied with Conveniencies for travelling, and every thing else, at the public Expence. The Time appointed for their Meeting was the first of *August* 314, and on that Day, they met accordingly[e], not from all Parts of the World, as we read in the Acts of the second Council of *Arles*[f], but from *Africa*, and most other Provinces of the West. *Sylvester* Bishop of *Rome* was invited to it; but he excused himself on account of his Age, and sent in his

Year of Christ 314.

The Donatists *complain of the Council of* Rome.

The Council of Arles.

[b] Buch. p. 272. cil. t. 1, p. 157. p. 106,
[c] Euseb. l. 10. c. 5.
[c] Euseb. & concil. ib.
[d] Euseb. ib. & con-
[f] Conc. Gen. t. 1.

his room the two Presbyters, *Claudianus* and *Vitus*, with *Eugenius* and *Cyriacus*, Deacons: The Bishop of *Ostia* sent likewise two Presbyters in his room [g]. By this Assembly, *Cæcilianus* was again declared innocent; and those who should falsly accuse their Brethren cut off from the Communion of the Church, without Hopes of being ever re-admitted, except at the Point of Death [h]. As to the schismatic Bishops, is was agreed, that such of them as abandoned the Schism should not forfeit their Dignity, but sit alternatively with the Catholic Bishop until one of them died [i]. The Council, before they broke up, acquainted the Bishop of *Rome* with their Proceedings, and at the same time sent him the Decrees they had made concerning the Discipline of the Church, not to be confirmed by him, as *Baronius* would make us believe [k], but that *by his means, as he held larger Dioceses, they might be the sooner known.* These are the very Words of the Council [l] (A).

Cæcilianus *declared innocent.*

The

[g] Concil. p. 1425. [h] Concil. ib. [i] Concil. ib. [k] Bar. ad ann. 314. n. 68. [l] Concil. p. 1425.

(A) Several Canons were made by this Council relating to the Discipline of the Church. 1. It was ordained that *Easter* should be kept on the same Day, and on a *Sunday*, by all the Churches in the World; and that the Bishops of *Rome* should acquaint the other Churches with the Day. But it was afterwards ordained, that the Bishop of *Alexandria* should fix the Day, and give timely notice of it to the Bishop of *Rome*, that by his means it might be notified to the whole Church. This Ordinance St. *Cyril* seemeth to ascribe to the Council of *Nice*; for he saith that it was *so enacted by a Synod composed of all the Saints of the Earth*; which, at the Time he wrote, that is about the Year 360, could be said of no other Synod but that of *Nice*. Pope *Leo the Great*, speaking of this Custom in a Letter to the Emperor *Marcian*, only says, that it was *established by the holy Fathers* (1). He meant, perhaps, the Fathers of *Nice*. But as they took no notice of such a Custom in their Letter to the Church of *Egypt*, I cannot suppose it to have been introduced by them. The Care of fixing the Day, and acquainting the Bishop of *Rome* with it, was probably committed to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, because the *Egyptians*,

(1) Leo, ep. 94. c. 1.

The other grand Council that was held during the Pontificate of *Sylveſter* was that of *Nice*, ſo famous in the Hiſtory of the Church: but the Biſhop of the reigning

Egyptians were thought to be better acquainted with the Motions of the heavenly Bodies than any other Nation. In other Provinces the Biſhops ſeem to have been utter Strangers to Aſtronomy, and to that Ignorance was chiefly owing their Diſagreement with reſpect to the celebration of *Eaſter*. This Cuſtom ſtill obtained in the Fifth Century, as appeareth from a Letter of *Leo the Great*, dated the 28th of *July* 454. For by that Letter he acquaints the Biſhops of *Gaul* and *Spain*, that the following Year 455, *Eaſter* would fall on the 24th of *April*, *as it had been ſettled in the Eaſt* (2). Before his Time *Innocent* I. being at a Loſs to know on what Day *Eaſter* ſhould be kept in 414, had Recourſe to *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, entreating him to examine that Point in a Council, and let him know what they determined, that he might notify it, as was cuſtomary, to other Churches. *Innocent* had quarrelled, on *Chryſoſtom*'s Account, with the Eaſtern Biſhops; and therefore choſe rather to be informed and directed by the *African* Biſhops than by them. 2. It was decreed, that ſuch as had been baptized by Heretics in the Name of the Trinity, ſhould not be rebaptized, but admitted into the Church only by the Impoſition of Hands. But to this Decree of the Council no greater Regard was paid than had been paid in St. *Cyprian*'s Time to the Deciſions of Pope *Stephen*. For in the Year 370, the ſame Practice of rebaptizing Heretics ſtill obtained in ſeveral Churches of *Africa*, as appeareth from *Optatus*, who wrote about that time. In the Eaſt ſome held, and ſome denied, the Validity of Baptiſm adminiſtered by an Heretic. Of the latter Opinion was the Great *Athanaſius*, who flouriſhed from the Year 326, to 373, and St. *Baſil*, who wrote about the Year 369, after examining, in his Letter to *Amphilochus*, the two oppoſite Practices, ſeemeth inclined to think the Baptiſm of Heretics null. According to the preſent Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, Baptiſm by whomſoever adminiſtered, whether *Jew*, *Gentile*, Heretic, *Mohammedan*, &c. whether Man or Woman, or even a Child, is valid, provided it be only adminiſtered with an Intention of adminiſtering it, without which every Sacrament, ſay they, is null. This Doctrine with reſpect to the Intention, proveth daily to timorous Conſciences the Source of endleſs Doubts and Perplexities, which can never be removed: for although they may know for certain that the Ceremony was performed, yet they can never know whether or no it was performed with the due Intention. In Confeſſion, for Inſtance, they may hear the Words of the Abſolution pronounced by the Prieſts; but they know nothing of his Intention, of the Intention

reigning City, saith *Eusebius* [o], being prevented, by his great Age, from undertaking so long a Journey, he sent *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, two *Roman* Presbyters, to supply his room [p], with Orders to agree, in his Name, to the Decisions of the Council [q]. In Process of Time such Orders grew out of Date; and the modest Name of *Roman* Presbyters, given to those who were sent by the Bishops of *Rome*, either to Councils or Princes, was changed into the lofty Title of *Legates a latere*. *Baronius* [r], and after him most Writers of the Church of *Rome*, maintain *Osius*, the celebrated Bishop of *Cordoua*, to have assisted, nay, and presided at the Council of *Nice*, as the Pope's Legate.

Osius did not assist at the Council of Nice as the Pope's Legate.

[o] Euseb. l. 3. c. 7. [p] Soz. p. 430. [q] Theodoret. l. 1. c. 6. [r] Bar. ad ann. 326. n. 20.

Intention of the Minister who baptized him, of the Bishop who ordained him, of the Priest who baptized, or the Bishops who ordained that Bishop, and so up to the Apostles, by whom the first Bishops were ordained. Should the right Intention have been wanting in any of these; should the Priest, while he pronounces the Words of Absolution, have his Thoughts employed on some other Object, as it may easily happen; the penitent Sinner would depart from his Tribunal with the whole Load of his Sins, and be damned, notwithstanding his Repentance, for, or more properly speaking, through want of Attention in the Priest. A most unchristian and impious Doctrine, placing our eternal Salvation in the Hands of others, and not in our own! 3. The Council decreed, that excommunicated Persons should be nowhere absolved from the Excommunication but in the Places where they had been excommunicated. The Bishops of *Rome* did not yet know, it seems that they were vested with an unlimited Power of binding and loosening, of excommunicating and absolving, with respect to all Persons and Places; for had *Sylvester* but dreamt of such a Power, we may well suppose he would never have suffered it to be thus controuled. Several other Canons were made by this Council, in all Twenty two; but it is foreign to my Purpose to take notice of them. I shall only observe, that the Council consisted of Thirty-three Bishops, and not of Two hundred, as *Baronius* supposeth, upon the Authority of St. *Austin*, whom he misunderstood; and that *Marinus*, Bishop of *Arles*, presided, his Name being placed at the Head of the Subscriptions, and the Names of *Sylvester*'s Legates after his.

(2) Leo, ep. 109.

Legate. *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, ſay they, repreſented the Perſon of the Pope; but *Oſius* held his Place, and the Place of all the Biſhops of the Weſt. That *Oſius* aſſiſted at the Council with the Character of the Pope's Legate, is affirmed, I own, by *Gelaſius* of *Cyzicus*, who flouriſhed about the End of the Fifth Century[r]: but *Euſebius*, who was preſent, mentioneth only *Vitus* and *Vincentius* as ſent thither by *Sylveſter*. In like manner all the Hiſtorians who have wrote of that Council after *Euſebius*, until the Time of *Gelaſius*, in naming thoſe Two Preſbyters and *Oſius*, which they all do, conſtantly diſtinguiſh the former by the Title of the Deputies, the Repreſentatives, *&c.* of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and never the latter. Beſides, *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, in ſubſcribing to the Canons of the Council, declare, that they do it *in the Name of the venerable Pope*, or Father *Sylveſter their Biſhop*[t]; whereas *Oſius* ſubſcribeth, like the other Biſhops, in his own Name. As to his preſiding at that great Aſſembly, his Name, it is true, is marked the firſt by *Socrates*[w], among thoſe who ſubſcribed to the Definitions and Canons of the Council; but yet I am inclined to believe that Honour not to have been conferred upon him, but upon *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Antioch*; for *John*, Biſhop of the ſame City, writing to *Proculus* about the Year 453, ſtyleth him the firſt of the Fathers aſſembled at *Nice*[x], and *Facundus* calleth him the firſt of the Council[y]. In the Chronicle of *Nicephorus* he is ſtyled the Head of the Fathers of *Nice*[z]: and from *Theodoret* we learn, that he ſat the firſt on the Right-hand in the Aſſembly, and harangued the Emperor[a], which it was the Preſident's Province to do (B).

Nor did he preſide.

The

[r] Gal. Cyz. de Nic. concil. l. 2. c. 5. p. 68. [t] Con. t. 2. p. 50. [w] Socr. l. 1. c. 23. [x] Facund. l. 8. c. 1. [y] Id. l. 2. c. 1. [z] Niceph. chron. [a] Theod. l. 1. c. 6.

(B) The Title of Preſident is given him in a Letter, which is com-

The Honour of preſiding belonged of Right to *Alexander* Biſhop of *Alexandria*; but he, it ſeemeth, declined it, perhaps to obviate the Complaints of the *Arians*, who looked upon him as a Party concerned, and one highly prejudiced againſt them. I know that the haranguing of *Conſtantine* is aſcribed to *Euſebius* the Hiſtorian, in the Title of the Chapter in which he mentioneth it [b], that *Sozomen* poſitively affirmeth it, and that the learned *Valeſius* thinks there is no room to doubt of it, ſince *Euſebius* was the moſt eloquent Biſhop of thoſe Times; and beſides he himſelf telleth us, that he pronounced a Speech in Praiſe of *Conſtantine* on occaſion of his entering into the Twentieth Year of his Reign, while he was ſitting in the midſt of the Miniſters of God [c]; meaning thereby, no doubt, the Biſhops aſſembled at *Nice*. That *Euſebius* harangued the Emperor before that venerable Aſſembly, is not at all to be queſtioned; but that the Biſhops, who compoſed it, ſhould have pitched upon one who was ſuſpected, or rather convicted, of *Arianiſm*, to addreſs the Emperor in their Name, at the Opening of the Council, ſeemeth to me highly improbable. The Orator, whoever he was, ſat in the firſt Place, or at leaſt in the ſecond (that I may not quarrel with *Baronius*, who will have the Place on the Left-hand to have been the moſt honourable [d]:) And what Right had the Biſhop of *Cæſarea* to that Honour? I may add, that a ſhort Compliment, ſuch as is that which the Preſbyter *Gregory* aſcribeth to *Euſtathius* of *Antioch* [e], had been far more proper on that Occaſion than

Euſebius of Cæſarea did not harangue the Emperor at the Opening of the Council.

[b] Euſeb. in vit. Conſt. l. 3. c. 11. [c] Euſeb. l. 1. c. 1. Valeſ. in not. p. 223. [d] Bar. ad ann. 325. n. 56 — 59. [e] Surius 10. Jul. p. 159.

commonly aſcribed to Pope *Felix* III (1), but I am well appriſed, that no great Streſs ſhould be laid on that Piece, ſince ſome ſurmiſe it to have been compoſed in the Eighth Century.

(1) Concil. t. 1. p. 1072.

than *Euſebius*'s long and tedious Panegyric, which therefore ſome ſuppoſe to have been pronounced on Occaſion of the magnificent Entertainment which *Conſtantine* gave the Biſhops, as they were preparing to return to their reſpective Sees; for he then entered into the Twentieth Year of his Reign, which began on the 25th of *July* 325, and it was on that Occaſion that *Euſebius* wrote, and delivered his Panegyric before the Emperor and the Fathers of the Council, as he himſelf declareth[f]. To conclude, had *Euſebius* been appointed by that great Aſſembly to addreſs the Emperor in their Name, his Modeſty had not prevented him from deſcribing the Spokeſman, ſo as to leave no room to doubt on whom that Honour had been conferred.

But on another Occaſion.

Before I diſmiſs this Subject, it may not be improper, nor foreign to my Purpoſe, to obſerve, that the Council of *Nice*, the firſt General or Oecumenical Council held in the Church, was convened by the Emperor, and not by the Biſhop of *Rome*; that the Biſhop of *Rome* did not preſide in it either in Perſon, or by his Legates, as they are pleaſed to ſtyle them; and conſequently that the Privilege, which they aſſumed in After-ages of aſſembling General Councils, and preſiding in them, ought to be deemed a moſt inſolent and unwarrantable Uſurpation. The Second Thing worthy of Notice with reſpect to this Council is its Fifth Canon, commanding all Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes to be finally decided in each Province by a Provincial Synod. The Words of the Canon are clear in themſelves, and beſides have been underſtood in this Senſe by all the Councils that were held, by all the Authors that wrote, for ſeveral Ages after[g]; nay, it was underſtood in this Senſe by ſome of the Popes themſelves, namely, by *Innocent* I. who, in one of his Letters to *Victricius* Biſhop of *Roan*, writes thus;

The Council of Nice *not convened by the Pope.*

The Council commands all Cauſes to be finally determined by Provincial Synods.

[f] Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 3. c. 14.

[g] Vide Elli. Du Pin de antiq. eccleſ. diſcip. p. 98, & ſeq.

thus; *If any Controverſy ſhould ariſe among the Clerks, whether they be of an inferior or ſuperior Rank, let it be decided, agreeably to the Council of* Nice, *in an Aſſembly of the Biſhops of the ſame Province*[h]. It is true, he addeth, *without prejudicing the Rights of the* Roman *See.* But that Reſtriction is his own, and not the Council's. Hence this Canon, directing all Cauſes to be thus tried, all Diſputes to be thus ended, was often quoted on occaſion of Appeals made to *Rome*, and employed as a Bulwark to reſtrain the incroaching Power of the Popes within due Bounds; but in proceſs of Time their Ambition, ſupported by the Favour of Princes, and the great Temporalities they acquired, bore all down before them.

The Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy firſt formed.

It was in the Pontificate of *Sylveſter*, and under the benign Auſpices of *Conſtantine*, that the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy was firſt formed and ſettled in the Manner it continueth to this Day; the new Form of Government, introduced by that Prince into the State, ſerving as a Model for the Government of the Church. In the Three firſt Centuries no other Hierarchy was known, no other Degrees thought of, but thoſe of Biſhops, Preſbyters, and Deacons. Of theſe alone was compoſed the whole Body of the Clergy; but with this Difference, that the Biſhop or Superviſor was the general Diſpoſer and Manager of all Things within the Bounds of his Juriſdiction, nothing being done there without his Conſent and Approbation, and the Preſbyters and Deacons his Aſſiſtants, or his Counſellors and Senate, as St. *Jerom*[k], and before him St. *Ignatius*[l], ſtyled them. This Order was probably introduced, according to *Grotius*[m], in Imitation of the *Jewiſh* Synagogues; for each Synagogue had its Ruler, who preſided over the reſt, its Paſtors, and its Eleemoſynaries; to the Ruler ſucceeded the Biſhop, to the Paſtors the Preſbyters,

[h] Inn. in epiſt. ad Vict. c. 3. [k] Hier. in c. 2. Iſai. [l] Vide Baſil. ep. 319. [m] Grot. de imp. ſumm. poteſt. c. 11. n. 8.

Preſbyters, and to the Eleemoſynaries the Deacons. It was the Biſhop's Office and Duty to preach the Word[n], to pray with his People[o], to adminiſter the Sacraments[p], to ordain Miniſters[q], to excommunicate Offenders[r], to abſolve Penitents[s], and to regulate and ſettle every thing relating to his particular Church[t], with the Conſent and Concurrence of the Preſbytery; for the Preſbyters were his Counſellors or Senate, and, together with him, preſided in the Conſiſtories of thoſe Times, as we learn from *Tertullian*, telling us, that in thoſe Courts *approved Elders preſided*[u]. Hence *Petrus de Marca* concludes the original Government of the Church to have been mixt of Monarchy and Ariſtocracy; or, to uſe his own Words, the Monarchical Government of the Church to have been tempered with the Ariſtocratical. As the Biſhop could not diſcharge, as he ought, the above-mentioned Functions, without reſiding among thoſe who were committed to his Care, his Reſidence was deemed abſolutely neceſſary, and Non-reſidence a moſt heinous Tranſgreſſion; inſomuch that St. *Cyprian* enumerating the Sins that brought the Wrath of God upon the Church in the bloody Perſecution of *Decius*, mentioneth Non-reſidence in the Biſhops as one[w]. Upon the Vacancy of a See, a new Biſhop was choſen in the room of the deceaſed, in ſome Places by the Clergy and People of that Church alone; in others, by the neighbouring Biſhops, the People and Clergy only expreſſing their Deſire, and giving Teſtimony of the Life and Manners of the Perſon propoſed; and in ſome by the joint Suffrages of the Clergy, of the People, and of the neighbouring Biſhops. Theſe three different Methods of electing we find practiſed at different Times with reſpect to the ſame Church; but on no Occaſion

The Office and Duty of Biſhops.

How choſen and ordained.

[n] Orig. in Ezek. hom. 3. [o] Juſtin. apol. 2. p. 98. [p] Tert. de bapt. p. 602. [q] Idem ib, p. 99. [r] Cyp ep. 38. p. 90. [s] Id. ep. 10. p. 30. [t] Tert. ib. p. 39. [u] Id. ib. p. 709. [w] Cyp. de laſp. n. 4. p. 278.

Occaſion was the Choice of the neigbouring Biſhops ſufficient, without the Conſent of the Clergy and People; nor the Election of the Clergy and People, without the Approbation of the neighbouring Biſhops. The Biſhop being thus elected and confirmed; he was in the next Place ordained; and this Ceremony was performed by the neighbouring Biſhops, in his own Church, and in the Preſence of his Flock, by the Impoſition of Hands. The new Biſhop, agreeably to a Cuſtom which obtained then, immediately gave Notice of his Promotion to other Biſhops, eſpecially to thoſe of the greater Sees, who, by receiving and anſwering his Letters, were ſaid to communicate with him, and to acknowlege him lawfully choſen.

The Office and Duty of Preſbyters.

In the Second Degree were the Preſbyters or Prieſts, whoſe Office or Province it was to aſſiſt the Biſhop in the Diſcharge of his Paſtoral Commiſſion, whence they are often ſtyled the Biſhop's Aſſiſtants: with his Conſent and Approbation they preached the Word, they prayed with the People, they adminiſtered the Sacraments, they abſolved Penitents, and, in ſhort, diſcharged every office which the Biſhop did, except thoſe of ordaining, confirming, and excommunicating; I ſay, with the Biſhop's Conſent and Approbation; for no ſpiritual Function could they perform without his Leave, as is manifeſt from *Tertullian* [x], *Origen* [y], St. *Cyprian* [z], and above all from St. *Ignatius*, in his famous Letter to the Church of *Smyrna* [a]. The Church, in thoſe happy Days, admitted none to the ſacred Functions, but ſuch as were known by a long Trial to be well qualified for ſo great a Charge. The Qualifications requiſite in a Preſbyter, ſo far as I can learn from the Antients, may be reduced to theſe Four Heads, his Condition in the World, his Converſation, his Learning, and his

Qualifications requiſite in a Preſbyter.

[x] Tertull. de bapt. p. 602. [y] Orig. hom. de Engaſt. vol. 1. p. 28. [z] Cyp. ep. 10. p. 29. ep. 11. p. 32. ep. 12. p. 37.
[a] Ign. ad Smyrn. p. 6.

his Age. He was not to be intangled with any worldly Affairs, with any ſecular Employments, but at perfect Liberty to apply himſelf wholly to the Functions of his Office[b]. He was to be of an unſpotted and exemplary Life[c]; and therefore, before Ordination, he was propoſed to the Preſbytery and People for their Teſtimony and Approbation. He was to be well verſed in the Scripture, and capable of teaching others, and inſtructing them in the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. As for Human Learning, it was not required in a Preſbyter; nay, by ſome it was condemned, particularly Logic and Philoſophy, as in a manner inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity[d], but at the ſame time highly commended and applauded by others as conducive to the right underſtanding of the Scripture, and neceſſary for confuting the Sophiſms of Heretics[e]; whence Logic is recommended by *Clemens Alexandrinus* to all Eccleſiaſtics, as a *Hedge to defend the Truth from being trod down by Sophiſts*[f]. As for the Age of a Preſbyter, he was to be ſtricken in Years, as the very Name of a Preſbyter or Elder ſufficiently declareth. However, if a young Man was endowed with extraordinary Gifts and Talents, his Age was diſpenſed with in reſpect both to the Sacerdotal and Epiſcopal Dignity. Thus was *Aurelius*, although young in Years, raiſed, in regard of his great Merit, to the Rank of a Preſbyter, as we read in St. *Cyprian*[g]; and the Biſhop of *Magneſia*, in St. *Ignatius*'s Time, was, it ſeemeth, but a young Man, ſince *Ignatius*, in his Letter to the *Magneſians*, exhorts them *not to deſpiſe their Biſhop's Age, but to yield him all due Reſpect and Reverence*[h]. Theſe were the Qualifications requiſite in a Candidate for the Miniſtry: if he was recommended by them (for no other Recommendation could avail him), he was admitted

[b] Cyp. ep. 66. p. 195. Tert. de præſcript. p. 89. [c] Idem ep. 68. p. 201. [d] Tert. adverſ. Hermog. p. 266. & de præſcript. p. 70, 71. [e] Orig. contra Celſ. l. 6. p. 279. Clem. Alex. ſtrom. l. 1. p. 207. l. 6. 472, &c. [f] Clem. Alex. ſtrom. l. 6. p. 472. [g] Cyp. ep. 33, p. 76. [h] Ign. ap. ad Magneſ. p. 31.

admitted to holy Orders; if not, he was rejected as unfit for the ſacred Function. The Perſon ordained was at Liberty to ſerve the Church where he had received his Orders, or any other where his Aſſiſtance might be wanted; for he was not ordained Miniſter of any particular Church, but of the Church univerſal.

The Inſtitution and Office of Deacons.

In the Third and laſt Degree were the Deacons, whoſe original Inſtitution was to *ſerve Tables*, as we read in the *Acts* [i]; that is, to inſpect the Poor, and relieve them by a proper Diſtribution of the Offerings made by the Faithful, which were committed to their Charge, although they could not diſpoſe of them without the Biſhops Knowlege [k]. They were ordained by the Impoſition of Hands [l], and therefore deemed Miniſters of the Altar, as well as Diſpenſers of Alms; and with a great deal of Reaſon, for they aſſiſted the Biſhops or Preſbyters in adminiſtering the Euchariſt, by delivering the Elements to the Communicants [m]; they carried the Euchariſt to ſuch as had not been able to aſſiſt with the reſt at Divine Service [n]; they preached, and, in the Abſence of the Biſhops and Preſbyters, conferred the Sacrament of Baptiſm [o]. The Preſbyters of a Church were not confined to a ſet Number; but the Deacons were, no Church having more than ſeven in the primitive Times, that being the original Number inſtituted by the Apoſtles. Thus the Church of *Rome* had but Seven in the Times of Pope *Cornelius* [p], and Pope *Sixtus* II [q]. The Church of *Saragoſa* the ſame Number in the Time of *Vincentius*, who flouriſhed under *Dioclesian* [r]. The Fourteenth Canon of the Council of *Neocæſarea*, or the Fifteenth according to the *Greek*, forbids this Number to be inlarged, even in the greateſt and moſt populous Cities [s]; whence St. *Jerom*

Their Number.

[i] Acts vi. 1, 2, 3, 4. [k] Conſt. Apoſt. l. 2. p. 31, 31, [l] Acts vi. 6. [m] Juſt. apol. 2. p. 97. [n] Idem ib. p. 98. [o] Tert. de bapt. p. 602 [p] Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. [q] Prud. de coron. mar. p. 71. [r] Idem ib. p. 91. [s] Conc. t. 1. p. 1448.

Jerom writes, that great Reſpect was paid to the Deacons, becauſe they were few in Number [t].

Subdeacons, Acolytes, Readers, &c.

As for the Subdeacons, Acolytes, Lectors, Janitors, and Exorciſts, they were not conſidered as anyways belonging to the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, being employed only in the meaner Offices of the Church, by the due Diſcharge of which they were to give Proof of their Integrity and Attention, in order to be raiſed to a higher Degree; for in thoſe Days very few, and none but upon ſome very extraordinary Occaſion, arrived at once, or, as they call it, *per ſaltum*, at the Epiſcopal Dignity.

Each Church independent.

During the Three firſt Centuries each Church was in a manner independent, that is, could make ſuch Regulations relating to its Diſcipline and Government as were judged proper and expedient, without the Concurrence and Authority of other Churches [u]. However, in all Matters of Moment, the Biſhops uſed to adviſe with one another, eſpecially with thoſe of the ſame Province, who frequently met to ſettle all Eccleſiaſtical Affairs within their reſpective Limits. *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, in *Cappadocia*, writes, that in his Province they met every Year [w]; and from the frequent Synods mentioned by St. *Cyprian*, we may conclude them to have been held in that Province at leaſt once a Year. Theſe Synods or Aſſemblies were compoſed of Biſhops, Preſbyters, Deacons, and Laymen, repreſenting the People of their ſeveral Churches [x]. They met by their own Appointment and Authority, there being no Chriſtian Magiſtrates in thoſe Days to convene Synods. Being thus aſſembled, they choſe in the firſt place one, and ſometimes two Biſhops, to preſide [y]. It was their Office and Duty to ſee the Point in queſtion calmly and fairly debated, to ſum up in each Debate what had

Frequent Synods held.

Of whom compoſed.

The Method they held.

[t] Hier. ep. 85. [u] Cyp. ep. 55, 72, 52. [w] Apud Cyp. ep. 75. [x] Cyp. ep. 14, 26, 31. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 16. & l. 7. c. 30. Act. Concil. Carth. apud Cyp. p. 443. [y] Euſeb. l. 5. c. 23, & 24.

had been urged on both Sides, to take the Votes and Suffrages of the Members of the Synod, and last of all to give their own [z]. In these Assemblies all Ecclesiastical Affairs were settled by the Majority of Votes, and their Decrees and Decisions were binding with respect to those Churches whose Representatives were present [a]; but were not so with respect to other Churches.

The Ecclesiastical Polity adapted to the Civil.

Such was the Hierarchy, such the Government of the Church, during the Three first Centuries. But in the Fourth and following Ages great Alterations were made in both, the Church adapting her Government to that of the State, namely, to the new Form of Government introduced by *Constantine*, who had settled her in Peace, and taken the Priesthood into his immediate Protection. For it was in his Reign that the Titles of *Patriarchs*, *Exarchs*, *Metropolitans*, were first heard of, or at least had any Power, Authority, or Privileges, annexed to them. That this Conformity between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Polity may appear more plainly, I shall premise a succinct Account of the former, as established by *Constantine* throughout the Empire. That Prince divided the whole *Roman* World into Four Prefectures, *viz.* the *East*, *Illyricum*, *Gaul*, and *Italy*, which were governed by Four Prefects, called *Præfecti Prætorio*. Until his Time the whole Empire was governed under the Emperors by Two Prefects only, as *Zosimus* informeth us [b]; and this Division is supposed to have been made by *Constantine*, jealous of the too great Power of those Magistrates. Each Prefecture was subdivided into several Dioceses, and each Diocese into several Provinces. Thus the Prefecture of the *East* contained Five Dioceses; *viz.* the *East* divided into Ten Provinces, *Egypt* into Six, *Pontus* into Eleven, *Asia* into Ten, and *Thrace* into Six.

The new Form of Government introduced by Constantine.

[z] Act. Concil. Carth. apud. p. 443, [a] Cyp. ep. 59, [b] Zos. l. 2. p. 623.

Six. Under the Prefecture of *Illyricum* were Two Dioceſes; *Macedon*, conſiſting of Eight Provinces, and *Dacia*, conſiſting of Four. The Prefecture of *Gaul* compriſed Three Dioceſes, *Gaul* made up of Seventeen Provinces, *Spain* of Seven, and *Britain* of Five. The Prefecture of *Italy* was divided into Two Vicarages or Lieutenancies; the one of *Rome*, comprehending Ten Provinces, under the Vicar of *Rome*, whence they were called *Suburbicarian* Provinces; the other of *Italy*, containing Seven Provinces, governed by the Vicar of *Italy*, who reſided at *Milan*, whence they were ſimply called Provinces of *Italy*. Under the Prefect of *Italy* was likewiſe *Weſt Africa*, and after *Conſtantine*'s Death *Weſt Illyricum*. The Prefects had other Officers under them, by whom the Provinces were more immediately governed. Theſe were, to name them according to their Rank and Dignity, Proconſuls, Vicars, Conſulars, Correctors, and Preſidents. Each Dioceſe had its Metropolis, and likewiſe each Province contained in the Dioceſe.

The Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Polity compared.

Now, if we compare the Civil Polity, thus deſcribed, with the Eccleſiaſtical, we ſhall find them in moſt Places anſwering each other in every reſpect, and one Biſhop raiſed above the reſt, according to the Rank that was given by this new Diviſion to the City in which he preſided. Thus, for Inſtance, the chief Cities of the Five Dioceſes of the Oriental Prefecture were; *Antioch*, the Metropolis of the Oriental Dioceſe; *Alexandria*, of the *Egyptian*; *Epheſus*, of the *Aſiatic*; *Cæſarea*, of the *Pontic*; and *Heraclea*, of the *Thracian*. Now the Biſhops of theſe Cities, in regard of the Eminence of their Sees, were exalted above all other Biſhops, and diſtinguiſhed with the Title of Exarchs; nay, and by Degrees they acquired, not to ſay uſurped, a kind of Authority and Juriſdiction over the Biſhops of the inferior Sees, which was afterwards confirmed to them by ſeveral Councils. In like manner the Biſhop of the Metropolis of each Province was, on account of the Dig-

nity of his See, honoured with the Title of Metropolitan, to which were annexed ſeveral Privileges, of which I ſhall ſpeak hereafter. When one Province was divided into Two, which often happened, the Eccleſiaſtical Polity was likewiſe altered, and the Biſhop of the new Metropolis raiſed to the Dignity of a Metropolitan. Several Inſtances might be alleged of ambitious Biſhops applying to the Emperors for a Diviſion of the Province, that their City might acquire the Title of Metropolis, and they, of courſe, that of Metropolitans. When the City of *Byzantium* was declared the Metropolis of another Empire, the Exarchate of *Heraclea*, the Metropolis of the *Thracian* Dioceſe, was by that Change, tranſferred from *Heraclea* to the new Metropolis; ſo that the Biſhop of *Heraclea* became Suffragan to the Biſhop of *Byzantium*, or, as it was then called, *Conſtantinople*, who, until that Time, had been Suffragan to him. Upon the Diviſion of a Province, the Churches were likewiſe divided, and the Biſhop of the new Metropolis acquired all the Privileges and Power of a Metropolitan over the Churches taken by the Change in the Civil Government from the antient Metropolis. But it was afterwards decreed, by the Council of *Chalcedon*, that if any City ſhould be raiſed to the Dignity of a Metropolis, the Biſhop of that City ſhould enjoy the Title, but not the Privileges of a Metropolitan. Thus the Biſhops of *Nice* and *Berytus* were honoured with the Title of Metropolitans, and took Place of all the other Biſhops of thoſe Provinces; but nevertheleſs continued to be Suffragans to their antient Metropolitans the Biſhops of *Nicomedia* and *Tyre*. For the ſame Reaſon ſeveral Biſhops in the Kingdom of *Naples* enjoy, to this Day, the Title of Metropolitans; but neither have, nor ever had, any Province or Suffragans. The abovementioned Decree was enacted by the Council of *Chalcedon*, to prevent the Biſhops from recurring, as they often did, to the Emperors, and to obviate the frequent

frequent Changes that were thereby introduced into the Church.

The Prefecture of *Illyricum* had but one Exarch, the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, the Metropolis of the *Macedonian* Dioceſe. In the Prefecture of *Gaul* there was no Exarch, but in the Two Dioceſes of *Gaul* and *Spain* as many Metropolitans as Provinces. Some there were, without all Doubt, in the Dioceſe of *Britain*, which was divided into Five Provinces, *viz. Maxima Cæſarienſis*, *Britannia Prima*, *Britannia Secunda*, *Valentia*, and *Flavia Cæſarienſis*. But in this Iſland an entire Change was made, by the *Saxons*, both in the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Polity. *The Prefectures of Illyricum Gaul, and Spain.*

Under the Prefect of *Italy* were Three Dioceſes, *viz. Italy*, *Weſt Illyricum*, and *Weſt Africa*. The Dioceſe of *Italy* was divided into Two Vicarages, as I have obſerved above, and governed by Two Vicars; the one called the Vicar of *Rome*, and reſiding in that City; the other ſtyled the Vicar of *Italy*, and reſiding at *Milan*. Under the former were Ten Provinces, *viz. Campania*, *Apulia*, *Lucania*, *Hetruria*, *Umbria*, *Picenum Suburbicarium*, *Sicily*, *Sardinia*, *Corſica*, and *Valeria*; and Seven under the latter, *viz. Liguria*, *Æmilia*, *Flaminia* or *Picenum Annonarium*, *Venetia*, *Iſtria*, *Alpes Cottiæ*, and the Two *Rhætiæ*. Such was the Civil Government of *Italy*, and intirely agreeable to the Civil was the Eccleſiaſtical. Thus the Biſhop of *Rome* enjoyed all the Privileges of a Metropolitan, with reſpect to the Biſhops of the Provinces ſubject to the Vicar of that City, or the *Suburbicarian* Provinces, as they are ſtyled by *Ruffinus*. In like manner the Biſhop of *Milan* exerciſed the Power and Authority of a Metropolitan over all the Biſhops under the Vicar of *Italy*. But the Power of both was confined within the Limits of their reſpective Vicarages. As neither had the Charge of a whole Dioceſe, they were not, like ſeveral Biſhops in the Eaſt, diſtinguiſhed with the Title of Exarch, which they had no Right to, but with that only of *The Prefecture of Italy.* *The Eccleſiaſtical Polity there intirely agreeable to the Civil.*

Metropolitan. However, the Power of the Biſhop of *Rome* far exceeded, within the Bounds of his Juriſdiction, that of other Metropolitans, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

The Eccleſiaſtical Polity in Africa.

In *Africa* the Eccleſiaſtical Polity varied greatly from the Civil. *Carthage* indeed, in the Proconſular Province of *Africa*, properly ſo called, was the Metropolis of all *Weſt Africa*, and the Biſhop of that City the Primate and Exarch. But in the other Five Provinces of that Dioceſe, *viz. Numidia*, the Two *Mauritanias*, *Cæſarienſis* and *Sitifenſis*, *Tingitana*, *Bizacena*, and *Tripolitana*, the ſenior Biſhop, in what City ſoever he preſided, enjoyed the Title and Privileges of Metropolitan, Regard being had to his Seniority, or the Time of his Ordination, and none to the Dignity of his See. And hence it is that, at different times, we find Biſhops of different Cities, within the ſame Province, acting as *Metropolitans*. Of *Weſt Illyricum*, the Third Dioceſe under the Prefect of *Italy*, I ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak hereafter.

The Dignities of Exarchs, Metropolitans, *&c. not of divine Inſtitution.*

Some Writers, namely, *Petrus de Marca*, Archbiſhop of *Paris* [c], *Chriſtianus Lupus* [d], *Emmanuel Schelſtrat* [e], Two eminent Divines, the one of *Louvain*, the other of *Antwerp*, and *Leo Allatius* [f], have taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that theſe Eccleſiaſtical Dignities owe their Origin to *Chriſt*, or the Apoſtles. But their Arguments are unanſwerably confuted by the learned *Ellies du Pin* [g]; and, beſides, it is evident, from the intire Conformity which the Eccleſiaſtical Government had, in moſt Places, with the Political State of the Empire, as eſtabliſhed by *Conſtantine*, that the Church, in forming the Hierarchy, I have deſcribed, adopted his Plan; and conſequently, that ſuch Dignities are not of divine, but of

[c] Pet. de Mar. l. 6. de conc. c. 1. [d] Lup. can. 4. Nic. par. 1. [e] Schel. antiq. illuſt. part. 1. diſſer 1. c. 3. art. [f] Leo All. de eccl. occid. & orient. conſef. l. 1. c. 2. [g] Du Pin de antiq. eccleſ. diſcip. diſſ. 1. n. 6.

of human Inſtitution. I might add, that it cannot be proved from Scripture, that the Apoſtles, in appointing Biſhops, gave more Power to one than to another, or any Power at all to one over the others.

The new Dignities added to the antient Hierarchy of the Church.

The new Dignities or Degrees, added to the antient Hierarchy of the Church, in the Fourth and following Centuries, were thoſe of *Metropolitan*, *Primate*, *Archbiſhop*, *Exarch*, and *Patriarch*. The Title of *Metropolitan* was given to the Biſhop of the chief City of a Province, and likewiſe that of *Primate*, he being *primus*, or the firſt of the Province; for ſuch was the original Signification of that Word in an eccleſiaſtical Senſe; but, in Proceſs of Time, the Title of *Primate* was reſtrained to the Biſhops of ſome great Cities. On the contrary the Title of *Archbiſhop* was originally beſtowed on Metropolitans only of great Eminence and Diſtinction; but, in the Eighth Century, it began to be given indifferently to all Metropolitans, and even to ſome Biſhops, diſtinguiſhed by no other Title. As the Biſhop of the Metropolis, or chief City, of a Province, was dignified with the Title of *Metropolitan*, ſo was the Biſhop of the Metropolis, or chief City, of a Dioceſe, with that of *Exarch*; which, however, we find ſometimes given to Metropolitans. As for the Title of *Patriarch*, it was at firſt common to all Biſhops, but afterwards confined to the Exarchs; and laſtly, to the Biſhops of the Five following Cities, *viz.* *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and *Jeruſalem*. It was firſt beſtowed on the Biſhop of *Rome*, by the Council of *Chalcedon*[h], after it had been long common to all the Exarchs of the Eaſt, as the learned *Du Pin* well obſerveth[i].

The Rights and Privileges of Metropolitans.

The Titles of Metropolitans, Primates, Exarchs, and Patriarchs, were not bare Names of Honour, but had

[h] Concil. t. 4. col. 58. Evagr. l. 2. c. 18. [i] Du Pin. c. 6. n. 5.

had several Rights and Prerogatives attending them. Thus the Metropolitans and Primates had, by their Prerogative, a Right to ordain the Bishops of their respective Provinces, to convene provincial Synods, and to have a general Superintendency or Inspection over the whole Province. The ordaining of Bishops was a Privilege common to the Metropolitan, with the other Bishops of the same Province; but with this Difference, that the Presence, or at least the Consent and Approbation of the Metropolitan was absolutely necessary; for, according to the Fourth and Sixth Canons of the Council of *Nice*, *who was not ordained, or approved, by the Metropolitan, was not to be a Bishop*. This Privilege was confirmed to the Metropolitans by many subsequent Councils, namely, by those of *Arles*, *Laodicea*, *Carthage*, *Chalcedon*, *Ephesus*[k], and many others. However, in the Fifth Century, the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Constantinople* began, in the East, to usurp this Prerogative, pretending, that no Bishops ought to be ordained in their respective Dioceses, without their Knowlege, Consent, and Approbation; and the Partriach of *Rome*, still more ambitious and encroaching, claimed a Right to ordain the Bishops throughout all the Provinces of the West, which occasioned endless Disputes, as we shall see in the Sequel of this History. As to the Second Privilege peculiar to the Metropolitans, they had a Right to summon the Bishops of their respective Provinces to meet when they thought proper; to appoint the Time and Place of their Meeting; to punish such as did not, without just Cause, comply with their Summons; and to preside in the Assembly. The general Care and Inspection, which they were charged with over the whole Province, imported, First, That all Complaints against, all Contests with or between

[k] Conc. Arel. can. 50. Laod. can. 12. Carth. can. 12. Eph. act. 4, &c.

tween the Biſhops of the Province, were to be brought to their Tribunal; and there heard, judged, and determined, not by the Metropolitan alone, but by him and the other Biſhops of the Province, in a Provincial Synod. Innumerable Inſtances might be alleged of Biſhops thus depoſed by their Metropolitans. Secondly, The Metropolitans had a Right to receive Appeals from the Sentence of inferior Biſhops, and, with the other Biſhops, to confirm or reverſe their Decrees. And laſtly, each Metropolitan was to keep a watchful Eye over the Biſhops of his Province, and take care that they diſcharged, as they ought, the Functions of their Office. Theſe Privileges were, in expreſs Terms, granted to the Metropolitans, by almoſt innumerable Councils, which it is needleſs, and would be too tedious, to name.

The Rights and Privileges of Patriarchs, or Exarchs.

As for the Patriarchs, or Exarchs; by their Prerogative, they were impowered to ordain the Metropolitans, to convene Dioceſan Synods, and to have a general Superintendency over their reſpective Dioceſes, ſuch as the Metropolitans had over their reſpective Provinces. The Biſhop of *Rome* had not the Charge of a whole Dioceſe, and therefore was not, properly ſpeaking, Exarch or Patriarch: his Juriſdiction did not extend beyond the Limits of the Vicarage of *Rome*, or the Suburbicarian Provinces; and no Inſtance can be produced of Metropolitans or Biſhops ordained by him, out of thoſe Provinces, till the Time of *Valentinian* III. Even in the Vicarage of *Italy* the Metropolitans of each Province ordained all the Biſhops, and were themſelves ordained by the Biſhops of the Province. But over the Suburbicarian Provinces the Biſhop of *Rome* exerciſed greater Power and Authority, than the Exarchs of the Eaſt did over the Provinces of their Dioceſes; for the latter left the Ordination of the Biſhops to their Metropolitans, whereas the former ordained not only the Biſhops of the metropolitan Cities, but all thoſe of the fore-mentioned Provinces: and the Reaſon

The Biſhop of Rome *not a Patriarch.*

son of this was, because these Provinces had no Metropolitans, to whom the Ordination of Bishops would of Right have belonged; so that the Prerogatives of the Metropolitans were all vested in the Bishop of *Rome* alone. As there were no Exarchs or Patriarchs in the West, the Bishops of each Province were, by several Councils, vested with the Power of ordaining their own Metropolitans; and that they were thus ordained in *Gaul*, *Spain*, and *West Africa*, is so manifest as to admit of no Dispute [k]. And yet the Sticklers for the See of *Rome* pretend the Bishops of that City to have a divine and inherent Right of ordaining all the Metropolitans throughout the Christian World, by themselves, their Vicars, or Delegates. To maintain this chimerical Right against the uncontestable Evidence of Facts, they tell us, that the Popes, for some Ages, neglected to exert the Power they had [l]. But from this Charge all Mankind will clear them, it being but too well known, that they never neglected the least Opportunity of exerting to the utmost the Power they had, and usurping the Power they had not. But Cavils aside, it is evident beyond Dispute, that the Popes never knew, nor dreamt of, any such Right or Prerogative, till they were told of it by their flattering Divines; at least Pope *Leo*, surnamed *the Great*, did not; for in one of his Letters to the Bishops of *Gaul* he disclaimeth, in express Terms, the Right of ordaining the Bishops of that Diocese [m]. To conclude, the Bishop of *Rome* was the only Metropolitan in that Vicarage; and, as such, had a Right to ordain all the Bishops of the Suburbicarian Provinces, or the Provinces subject to the Vicar of *Rome*; but, for a considerable Tract of Time, there is no Instance of their ordaining either Bishops or Metropolitans out of that District.

The Bishops of Rome *have no Right to ordain the Metropolitans.*

As for the Title of Archbishop, it is in itself a bare Name of Honour; whence, in some Countries, espe-

The Title of Archbishop in itself a

[k] Vide Du Pin dissert. 1. n. 13. [l] Idem ib. [m] Leo, ep. 89.

eſpecially in *Italy*, ſeveral are diſtinguiſhed with that Title, who indeed take Place of, but have no Power or Authority over, other Biſhops. And thus far of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, as ſettled in the Fourth and following Centuries, of the different Degrees that compoſe it, and the Prerogatives peculiar to each Degree, the Knowlege whereof is abſolutely neceſſary for the right Underſtanding of the many Conteſts and Diſputes in Point of Juriſdiction, which I ſhall have Occaſion to touch upon in the Sequel of this Hiſtory; for it was not at once, but by Degrees, and not without great Oppoſition, that the Biſhops of *Rome*, extending their Authority beyond the Limits of that Vicarage, which was at that time the Boundary of their Juriſdiction, acquired the unlimited Power they now enjoy, with the arrogant Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*.

bare Name of Honour.

But to return to *Sylveſter*, in whoſe Pontificate this great Change began; I need not employ many Words to ſhew the Forgery of the ſo much boaſted Donation of all *Italy*, ſuppoſed to have been made by *Conſtantine* to *Sylveſter*, in the Spring of the Year 324, Four Days after he had been baptized by that Pontiff, ſince the Inſtrument of that Donation is now looked upon as ſuppoſititious, by all who have the leaſt Tincture of Learning. The Arguments they allege againſt it, are: 1. That more than Twelve Copies of that Inſtrument are ſtill extant, all differing from one another. 2. That it evidently appeareth, from Two Conſtitutions of *Conſtantine*, ſtill to be ſeen in the *Theodoſian* Code[m], that he was not at *Rome*, but at *Theſſalonica*, in the Spring of the Year 324. 3. That neither *Euſebius*, who hath given us a very minute and particular Account of the Actions of that Prince, nor any other cotemporary Writer, hath ſo much as hinted at ſo memorable a Fact. 4. That all the antient

The Donation of all Italy *made by* Conſtantine *to the Pope, a Forgery.*

[m] Cod. Theod. l. 4. de navicul. et. l. un. de his qui veniam ætat.

tient Writers, both *Greek* and *Latin*, agree, that *Conſtantine* was not baptized at *Rome*, but at *Nicomedia*, when he lay at the Point of Death[n]. Let thoſe, who ſtand up in Defence of that Donation, give ſatisfactory Anſwers to theſe Reaſons, and I ſhall conclude with them, that *Italy* being, by ſuch a Donation, disjoined from the Empire, the Emperors who ſucceeded *Conſtantine*, had no Claim or Title to that Country; that none of their Conſtitutions were binding there; and conſequently that, by the Inhabitants of *Italy*, Recourſe ought to be had, in all Caſes, not to the Civil, but to the Canon Law: for ſuch pernicious Doctrines have been broached, publiſhed, and maintained, as natural Deductions from *Conſtantine*'s great Generoſity to *Sylveſter*[o]. In *Rome* is ſtill to be ſeen, in a moſt ſumptuous Chapel, cloſe to the *Lateran*, the Baptiſtery or Font in which *Conſtantine* is ſaid to have been baptized. The Chapel is adorned with noble Paintings, repreſenting that auguſt Ceremony, as performed by *Sylveſter*, in the magnificent Drapery, and ſtately Apparel, of the preſent Popes. Four Days after this Ceremony, *Conſtantine*, ſenſible of his Obligations to *Sylveſter*, rewarded him for his Trouble with a Fee, as *Lucheſini* the *Scolopian* expreſſeth it, anſwering in ſome Degree to the Greatneſs of the Favour he had received at his Hands; a Fee worthy of ſo great a Prince, of ſo great a Pope[p]. The Fee, which that Writer, otherwiſe a Man of Learning, maketh a long and tedious Deſcant upon, was no leſs than the City of *Rome*, and all *Italy*. That *Conſtantine* was baptized at *Nicomedia*, and not at *Rome*, is affirmed, in expreſs Terms, by *Theodoret*[q], *Sozomen*[r], *Socrates*[s], and *Pho-*

Conſtantine *baptized at* Nicomedia, *and not at* Rome.

[n] Vide Petr. de Marcar, l. 3. c. 12. l. 6. c. 6. Schelſtrat. antiq. illuſtr. par. 2. diſſert. 3. c. 8. Got. in chron. cod. Theod. ann. 324. Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 4. c. 61. [o] Afflict in conſtit. in prælud. quæſt. 2. n. 2. et quæſt. 20. n. 1. Tappia de jur. regni, l. 1. et de leg. l. 1. n. 6. Ponte de poteſt Proreg. tit. 11. n. 26. [p] Luch. de imp. poteſt. in Ital. [q] Theod. l. 1. 2. 32. [r] Soz. l. 2. c. 34. [s] Socr. l. 1. c. 39

Photius[t], among the *Greeks*; and, among the *Latins*, by St. *Ambroſe*[u], St. *Jerom*[w], and the Council of *Rimini*[x]. *Emanuel Schelſtrat*, on one Side, aſhamed to reject, or even to queſtion, ſuch Authorities, but, on the other, unwilling to rob *Sylveſter* of that Glory, will have *Conſtantine* to have been baptized in both Places. It is well known, ſaid he, that *Conſtantine*, in the latter End of his Life, was greatly biaſſed in favour of the *Arians*, and their Tenets. Now a Practice obtained among them of rebaptizing ſuch as came over to their Sect from the Catholic Church; and, to conform to this Cuſtom, *Conſtantine* was, in all Likelihood, prevailed upon by *Euſebius*, the *Arian* Biſhop of *Nicomedia*, who aſſiſted him on his Deathbed[y]. Thus *Schelſtrat*. But, it is certain, that, in *Conſtantine*'s Time, the *Arians* allowed the Validity of Baptiſm adminiſtred by the Catholics; for, long after, we find St. *Auſtin* upbraiding them with the Practice of rebaptizing, as a Novelty lately introduced among them[z]. Beſides, who is ſo little verſed in the Hiſtory of the Church, as not to know, that, in thoſe early Times, a very bad Cuſtom univerſally prevailed, at leaſt, among Perſons of Diſtinction, who embraced the Chriſtian Religion, namely, that of putting off their Baptiſm to their Deathbed, or till they were upon the Point of expoſing themſelves to ſome great Danger? Thus *Theodoſius the Great*, though he had not only openly profeſſed the Chriſtian Religion, but given many Inſtances of an extraordinary Piety, yet did not chooſe to be baptized till he fell dangerouſly ill at *Theſſalonica*[a]. In like manner *Valentinian* II. delayed his Baptiſm till the Approach of a Battle with the Barbarians, when he ſent, in great Haſte, for St. *Ambroſe* to adminiſtred

[t] Phot. cod. 127. [u] Ambroſius ſerm. de obitu Theodoſ. [w] Hier. in chron. [x] Soz. l. 4. c. 18. [y] Schelſtr. antiq. illuſt. part. 2. diſſert. 3. c. 6. [z] Auguſt. de hæreſ. c. 48. [a] Socrat. l. 5. c. 6. Soz. l. 7. c. 4.

minister that Sacrament to him. But while the good Bishop was crossing the *Alps*, on his Way to *Vienna*, where the Emperor then was, he received the melancholy News of his having been inhumanly murdered by some of his own Officers, at the Instigation of *Arbogastus*. His Death was greatly lamented by St. *Ambrose*, who, in the elegant Oration, which he pronounced on Occasion of his Obsequies, maintained, that the fervent Desire of Baptism had the same Effect as the Sacrament itself; and consequently, that the Sins of the deceased Prince being thereby cancelled, it was not to be doubted, but from this Life he had passed to eternal Bliss [b]. Innumerable Instances of the same Nature occur in History, which were, it seemeth, utterly unknown to the Author of the Acts of Pope *Sylvester*, upon whose sole Authority the Fable hath been credited of *Constantine*'s receiving Baptism at the Hands of *Sylvester*, soon after his Conversion. That Impostor, whoever he was, is supposed to have lived in the Eighth Century, long after the Custom of deferring Baptism to the Point of Death had been utterly abolished. What gave Countenance to such a Custom, was an Opinion then generally received, and still held by the Church of *Rome*; *viz.* That by the Waters of the sacred Font Men were washed clean, not only from the original, but from all other Sins. This proved a great Encouragement to Vice, when Piety began (and it began but too early) to decay among Christians; and therefore the Fathers of the Church, especially *Basil*, his Brother *Gregory* of *Nyssa*, and St. *Ambrose* [c], employed all the Oratory they were Masters of, in crying down such a pernicious and wicked Custom, as they style it; so that it was at last quite laid aside. Whether Confession ought not, on the same Account, to be put down, I shall leave the Reader to judge; and only

What gave Countenance to the Custom of deferring Baptism to the Point of Death.

[b] Amb. orat. in fun. Val. [c] Greg. in orat. de bapt. Amb. in ser. de sanct. et alibi.

only obſerve here, by the way, that had the Virtue and Efficacy, aſcribed now to Confeſſion, been known in thoſe Times, Sinners needed not have delayed Baptiſm to the Point of Death, ſince their Sins had been no leſs effectually cancelled by Confeſſion, than by Baptiſm.

Spurious Pieces aſcribed to Sylveſter.

As for the Letter from the Council of *Nice* to *Sylveſter*, his Anſwer, the Acts of a Council of 275 Biſhops, ſuppoſed to have been held by him, at the Requeſt of the Fathers of *Nice*, to confirm their Canons and Decrees (C), his Letter to the Biſhops of *Gaul*, in favour of the Church of *Vienne*; the Acts of Two other

(C) The Style of the Letter from the Council to *Sylveſter* is quite barbarous and unintelligible. It begins thus: *Gloriam corroborata de Divinis Myſteriis. Eccleſiaſticæ utilitatis quæ ad robur pertinent Eccleſiæ Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ ad ſedem tuam* Romanam *explanata & de Græco redacta ſcribere confitemur.*—— *Nunc itaque ad veſtræ ſedis argumentum accurrimus roborari.* The reſt is written in the ſame Style; the Conſuls are called *Sovereigns*, and the Letter is dated Five or Six Days after the Opening of the Council. The Deſign of the Impoſtor was, to make the Fathers of *Nice* recur to *Sylveſter* for a Confirmation of their Decrees. *Sylveſter*'s Anſwer is of a piece with the Letter of the Council; it ſuppoſeth him to have added ſomething to the Council; mentions the Cycle of *Victorinus*, who was not born in *Sylveſter*'s Time, nor many Years after; and beareth a falſe Date: As for the Council ſaid, and by ſome ſtill maintained, to have been held at *Rome*, to confirm the Canons of *Nice*, it was utterly unknown to all the Antients. And who can believe, that none of the Antients ſhould ever have heard of a Council held in the Metropolis of the Empire, and conſiſting, as we are told, of Two hundred and Seventy-five Biſhops, or, if they had heard of it, that they would never have mentioned it? Beſides, it is ſaid to have been held at *Rome*, in the Preſence of *Conſtantine*; and it is certain, that the Emperor was not in *Rome* at the Time the Council is ſuppoſed to have been held. The Canons, which are ſuppoſed to have been made on this Occaſion, contain Regulations repugnant to the Practice of thoſe Times, and which it was then impoſſible to obſerve. The firſt Canon relateth to the Time when *Eaſter* was to be kept; but what is there determined no Man can know. The Second is no leſs unintelligible than the Firſt: *Ut unuſquiſque Epiſcopus rediens ad Parochiam ſuam Compaginem Salutationis plebi tuæ innoteſcat.* Theſe are the Words of this Canon. The Third forbids the Eccleſiaſtics to appear before

other Councils, said to have been held by him at *Rome*, they are all Pieces universally rejected by Men of Learning, and deemed no less fabulous than the Instrument of *Constantine*'s Donation, and that Prince's Journey with *Sylvester* to the Council of *Nice*, as it is related in the Acts of the latter, even in those which *F. Combefis* published in 1660. They are in *Greek*, and that Writer undertaketh to defend them as genuine [d]; but we need no other Proof than the Account they give of that Journey, to conclude them incapable of being defended. *Sylvester* died on the 31st of *December* 335, after having governed the Church of *Rome* for the Space of Twenty-one Years and Eleven Months [e].

CONSTANTINE.

MARK,

Twenty-third BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 336.

SYLVESTER was succeeded by *Mark*, on the 18th of *January* 336. He is passed over by *Theodoret* [f], but named by *Optatus* [g], *Ruffinus* [h], St. *Austin* [i], St. *Jerom* [k], and *Sozomen* [l]. We know nothing certain either of his Life or Administration. *Ana-*

[d] Comb. act. &c. p. 258. [e] Bucher. cycl. p. 167, 273. [f] Theod. l. 2. c. 12. [g] Opt. l. 2. p. 48. [h] Ruffin. l. 10. c. 22. [i] August. ep. 165. [k] Hier. chron. [l] Sozom. l. 2. c. 20.

fore secular Judges, let the Action be what it will; which is repugnant to the Discipline of those Times. The Fourth will have those, who enter themselves among the Clergy, to pass through all the Degrees, and fixes the Time which they are to continue in each Degree. They are to be Janitors or Door-keepers one Year, Lectors or Readers Twenty, Exorcists Ten, Acolytes Five, Subdeacons Five, Deacons Five, and Priests Six; so that none under Threescore could attain to the Episcopal Dignity; which is highly absurd in itself, and contrary to the Practice of those Times.

Anaſtaſius indeed telleth us, that by him the Biſhop of *Oſtia* was firſt appointed to ordain the Biſhop of *Rome*, and to carry the *Pallium* or Pall; where *Baronius* obſerveth, that the Pall is here mentioned for the Firſt time [m]. But *Anaſtaſius* is not a Writer we can depend upon. It is certain, however, that the Biſhops of *Oſtia* have long enjoyed this Privilege; for it is mentioned by St. *Auſtin* [n], and likewiſe in a Memorial preſented by the Clergy of *Rome* in 418 to the Emperor *Honorius*, on Occaſion of the Election of Pope *Zoſimus* [o]. The Letter which the Biſhops of *Egypt* are ſaid to have wrote to this Pope, and his Anſwer to them, are rejected even by *Baronius* [p], and very juſtly; for the Pope's Anſwer is dated Eighteen Days after his Death. He died on the 7th of *October* the ſame Year he had been choſen [q], and was buried in the Cœmetery of *Balbina*, which was thenceforth called after his Name [r]. His Body is now worſhipped in the Church of St. *Laurence* at *Florence*, though no Mention is made by any Writer of its having ever been tranſlated thither [s].

The Biſhop of Rome *ordained by the Biſhop of* Oſtia.

CONSTANTINE and his Three Sons,

JULIUS,

CONSTANTINE, CONSTANTIUS, and CONSTANS.

Thirty-fouth BISHOP *of* Rome.

UPON the Death of *Mark* the See was vacant for the Space of Four Months, that is, to the 6th of *February* 337, when *Julius* was choſen [t]. He is ſaid to have held a Council of an Hundred and Sixteen Biſhops in the *December* of the ſame Year [u]. But the Date of this Council putteth *Baronius* to a Stand;

Year of Chriſt 337.

[m] Bar. ad ann. 336. n. 64 [n] Aug. coll. die 3. c. 16. [o] Vide Du Pin diſſert. 1. n. 13. [p] Bar. ibid. n. 60, 61. [q] Soz. l. 2. c. 20. Hier. chron. Buc. p. 267, 273. [r] Front. cal. p. 141. [s] Bolland. Pont. p. 50. [t] Buch. p. 273. [u] Concil. tom. 2. p 527.

Falsly said to have held a great Council at Rome.

Stand; for in the Date are marked the Consuls, the Year of the Emperors, and the Indiction. Now, according to the Consuls, it must have been held in 337, according to the Year of the Emperors, in 340, and, according to the Indiction, in 347. The Annalist spareth neither his Words nor his Labour to solve, or rather to patch up, this Difficulty; but, being sensible, after a long, tedious, and puzzling Descant, that he laboureth in vain, he concludes, that the Text hath been altered [w]. He might have saved himself a great deal of Trouble, by owning at once what hath been plainly proved since by *Blondel* [x], *viz.* that no such Council was ever held.

When *Julius* was raised to the Pontificate, the celebrated *Athanasius*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, lived in Banishment as *Treves*; but the Year following he was allowed to return to his Church, by the Three Emperors, *Constantine*, *Constantius*, and *Constans*, who had succeeded their Father in 337. The *Eusebians*, that is, the *Arian* Faction headed by *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, at whose Instigation he had been banished by *Constantine*, alarmed at his Return, wrote bitter Letters against him to the Three Princes, and likewise to the Bishop of *Rome*. To the latter they dispatched with their Letters *Macarius* a Presbyter, and the two Deacons, *Martyrius* and *Hesychius*. *Athanasius* no sooner heard of this Embassy, than he, in his Turn, dispatched some Presbyters to oppose the Attempts of his Enemies, and defend his Innocence against the Calumnies, which he well knew they were sent to spread against him, not only at *Rome*, but all over the West [y]. Upon their Arrival, *Macarius* privately withdrew from *Rome*, and the other Two were so confounded by the Deputies of *Athanasius*, at a private Conference held before the Pope, that, to gain Time, they had no other Resource but to

The Arians *write to* Julius *against* Athanasius.

They desire Julius *to assemble a Council.*

[w] Bar. ad ann. 337. n. 67. [x] Blond. decret. p. 451. [y] Athan. apol. 2. p. 741—745.

to appeal to a Council, which they begged the Pope to aſſemble, and to give timely notice thereof both to *Athanaſius* and the *Euſebians*. They bragged that, before the Council, they would make good the Charge they had brought againſt *Athanaſius*, and offered to take *Julius* himſelf for their Judge [z]. This Offer, we may be ſure, was readily accepted by the Biſhop of *Rome*, who immediately wrote to *Athanaſius*, inviting him to the Council, and at the ſame time deſired the Deputies of the *Euſebians* to acquaint their Party, that, agreeably to their Requeſt, a Council ſhould be ſoon convened. *Athanaſius*, upon the Receipt of the Pope's Letter, ſet out, without Delay, for *Rome*, where he arrived in the latter End of the Year 339. After his Arrival the Biſhop of *Rome* diſpatched *Elpidius* and *Philoxenes*, two of his Preſbyters, with Letters to the *Euſebians*, ſummoning them to the Council, which their Deputies had demanded, and acquainting them with the Time and Place in which it was to be held [a]. The Place was *Rome*, and the Time the Month of *June* 341, according to the moſt probable Opinion. The other Biſhops aſſembled at the Time appointed; but the *Euſebians*, inſtead of appearing at the Council of *Rome*, which had been convened at their Requeſt, aſſembled one at *Antioch*, and there, without waiting for the Determination of *Julius*, whom they had choſen for their Judge, they depoſed *Athanaſius*, and appointed *Gregory* Biſhop of *Alexandria* in his room; nay, they even detained the Deputies ſent by the Pope till the Time appointed for the Meeting of the Council was expired, that they might afterwards plead, as they did, the Shortneſs of the Term preſcribed for them to meet in [b]. In the Council of *Rome* the Cauſe of *Athanaſius* was examined, and he, after the ſtricteſt Scrutiny, declared innocent with one Voice by the Fifty

They decline appearing at the Council of Rome; *aſſemble one at* Antioch; *and there depoſe* Athanaſius;

who is declared innocent in the Council of Rome.

[z] Athan. apol. 2. p. 741---745. [a] Idem ib. Socr. l. 2. c. 15. Soz. l. 3. c. 8. [b] Athan. ib. p. 744. & ad Solit. p. 816.

Fifty Bishops who composed it[c]; so that *Julius* and the rest continued to communicate with him as a Bishop[d], which was declaring him unlawfully deposed. Several other Bishops, who had been deposed by the *Arians*, came to lay their Complaints before the Council, and, among the rest, *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, and *Paul* Bishop of *Constantinople*. The former had been condemned as an Heretic by a Council held at *Constantinople* in 336, and consisting entirely of *Arian* Bishops. As nobody appeared against him during the Fifteen Months he continued at *Rome*, and the Declaration of his Faith, which, at the Request of *Julius*, he gave under his own Hand, was judged quite orthodox by the Pope and the Council, he was readmitted to the Communion of the Catholic Church[e]. But whether they did not judge too favourably of his Belief, may be very much questioned: *Epiphanius* at least was no-ways satisfied with it[f]. And truly it would be no easy Task to clear him from the Heresy of *Sabellius* and *Samosatenus*, denying the Trinity of the Divine Persons[g]: but to examine so perplexed and intricate a Point, would be foreign to my Purpose. *Socrates*[h] and *Sozomen*[i] write, that *Julius*, by the Authority of his See, reinstated all the Bishops who had been displaced by the *Arians*; that he supported and defended their Innocence with Letters full of Vigour and Liberty; severely reprimanded those who had deposed them; summoned some of them to appear at *Rome*, in a limited Time, to justify their Conduct; and, lastly, that he threatened to treat them as they deserved, if they did not forbear raising Disturbances in the Church. In virtue of these Letters, saith *Socrates*, the Bishops were restored to their Sees. But *Sozomen*

Neither Athanasius nor any other Bishop restored by Julius.

[c] Athan. ad Solit. p. 748. [d] Idem ibid. Hilar. frag. p. 26. [e] Idem ib. p. 750. [f] Epiph. 72. c. 4. [g] Vide Petav. dog. t. 2. l. 1. c. 13. Hilar. de Trin. l. 7. p. 46. [h] Socr. l. 2. c. 15. [i] Soz. l. 3. c. 8.

men nameth only *Athanaſius*, and *Paul* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. It is ſurpriſing that the Advocates for the See of *Rome* ſhould allege the Teſtimony of theſe two Writers, to prove that the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* was acknowledged by the Orientals; that his Juriſdiction was univerſal; when they themſelves muſt know (for I cannot ſuppoſe them ſo ignorant as not to know) that the Hiſtorians whom they quote were groſly miſtaken. For it is manifeſt from *Athanaſius* [k], that *Julius* wrote only two Letters to the *Euſebians*; one before the Council met, inviting them to it; and the other, while the Council was ſtill ſitting, which I ſhall ſpeak of hereafter; and in neither of theſe doth *Julius* take upon him either to threaten or command. The above-mentioned Hiſtorians ſeem to have jumbled theſe two Letters together, and to have made a Third out of them, with ſome Improvements of their own. As to his reſtoring the depoſed Biſhops to their Sees, it is certain he did not, ſince *Athanaſius* continued in the Weſt till the Year 349, when he was reſtored by the Council of *Sardica*. *Paul* indeed was reinſtated ſooner, but not till the See of *Conſtantinople* became vacant by the Death of *Euſebius*, who had been tranſlated from *Nicomedia* to that City. I appeal to the *Roman* Catholics themſelves, and leave them to judge whether it is at all probable, that the Emperor *Conſtantius*, and the Oriental Biſhops, incenſed as they were againſt *Paul* and *Athanaſius*, whom they had condemned and depoſed in Two Synods, ſhould, out of Reſpect to the Pope, ſuffer them thus tamely to return to their Sees, and drive out thoſe whom they had placed in their room. This had been owning themſelves guilty, and reverſing the Sentence they had but lately pronounced, which, as will appear, they were no-ways in an Humour to do.

While

[k] Athan. ap. 2. p. 739.

The Euſebians *write to* Julius;

While the Council of *Rome* was yet ſitting, the Pope's two Deputies, *Elpidius* and *Philoxenes*, returning from the Eaſt, delivered to *Julius* a Letter from toe *Euſebians*, which may paſs for a Maſter-piece of the kind; for, without departing from, or intrenching upon, the Reſpect that was due to the Biſhop of the Imperial City, they, at the ſame time, commend, cenſure, menace, and rally him in a moſt cruel manner. They begin with alleging ſeveral frivolous Excuſes for not appearing at the Council, ſuch as the *Perſian* War, which, by the way, did not prevent their aſſembling at *Antioch*; the Shortneſs of the Term preſcribed for their Meeting; the Pope's writing only to ſome of them, and not to all, as he ought to have done; and, finally, his writing to them in his own Name alone, which was tacitly taxing him with taking too much upon him. They then launch out ironically, it ſeemeth, into the higheſt Encomiums on the Church of *Rome*, ſtyling her the firſt of all Churches, the School of the Apoſtles, the Metropolis of true Piety. However, the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel, add they, came out of the Eaſt; and, after all, we ought to be looked upon as Inferiors to none, though perhaps we may not have ſuch numerous and flouriſhing Churches, as ſome have, ſince the want of Numbers may be abundantly ſupplied by the Piety of a few. As to Rank, we are all equal, the Greatneſs of the Cities, in which we preſide, adding nothing to the Dignity we all enjoy. In the next place, they expreſs great Concern at the little Regard ſhewn by ſome to the Deciſions of Councils, which ought to be revered by all, and deemed immutable. This was modeſtly cenſuring the Pope for not acquieſcing to the Decrees of the Councils of *Tyre* and *Conſtantinople* condemning *Athanaſius*. In the End they allege ſeveral Things both againſt *Athanaſius*, and *Marcellus* Biſhop of *Ancyra*; and conclude with telling *Julius*, that if he renounced all Correſpondence and Intercouſe with the Biſhops

Biſhops they had depoſed, and acknowleged thoſe they had placed in their room, they would continue to communicate with him; but if he refuſed to comply with their Deciſions and Decrees, they ſhould think themſelves obliged to act in a very different manner[1]. *Julius* was ſo mortified with this Letter, that he ſuppreſſed it for ſome time, hoping the *Euſebians* would ſend Deputies, who, he preſumed, would expreſs their Sentiments by Word of Mouth, and in a different Style, But, none appearing, he was obliged to lay the Letter he had received before the Fathers of the Council, who, after expreſſing the greateſt Indignation againſt the *Euſebians*, adviſed the Pope to anſwer it; which he did accordingly, by that excellent Letter, which hath been preſerved intire among the Works of *Athanaſius*. He beginneth with complaining, in very modeſt Terms, of the Animoſity they betrayed in their Letter, to which he thought he had given no Occaſion; unleſs they had taken it amiſs, that he had ſummoned them to the Council; which he could not perſuade himſelf they did, ſince, at the Requeſt of their Deputies, he had appointed the Council to meet, and, at their Requeſt, invited them to it. As for the Regard due to the Decrees and Deciſions of Councils, he told them, that they had treſpaſſed the firſt againſt the Decrees of the Oecumenical Council of *Nice*, by admitting the *Arians* to their Communion, which he conceived to be more criminal in them, than it was in him, to receive *Athanaſius* and *Marcellus*. He reproacheth them with another Tranſgreſſion of the Canons of the Church, namely, with that of paſſing from one Biſhoprick to another, which *Euſebius* had done. He then juſtifieth his Conduct with regard to *Athanaſius* and *Marcellus*; exhorts the *Euſebians*, with great Zeal and Earneſtneſs, to find out ſome Remedy againſt

and threaten to ſeparate themſelves from his Communion.

Julius's *Anſwer to their Letter.*

[1] Athan. ap, 2. p. 740---749. & ad Solit. p. 816. Soz. l. 3. c. 8. Euſeb. l. 6. c. 43. Hil. frag. p. 25.

againſt the Evils and Diſorders that reigned in the Eaſt, which he deſcribeth at length; and concludeth with complaining of the Orientals for condemning and depoſing Biſhops, thoſe eſpecially of the Apoſtolic Sees, without the Concurrence or Knowledge of their Brethren in the Weſt [m].

Julius, finding his Letter made no Impreſſion on the *Euſebians*, applied with ſeveral other Biſhops to the Emperor *Conſtans*, who, at their Requeſt, propoſed to his Brother *Conſtantius* the aſſembling of an Oecumenical Council, in order to put an End to thoſe unhappy Diviſions. To this Propoſal *Conſtantius* agreed; and accordingly, by the Command of the two Princes, a numerous Council met in 347, at *Sardica*, the Metropolis of *Dacia* in *Illyricum* [n]. *Julius*, apprehending it dangerous to abandon his Flock at that Juncture, did not aſſiſt in Perſon, but by his Deputies *Archidamus* and *Philoxenes*, who ſigned in his Name [o]. The Orientals came, but withdrew ſoon after, upon the Council's refuſing to exclude *Athanaſius*, and ſome others, whom they had condemned [p]. But by the orthodox Biſhops, who remained, the Acts of the Council of *Rome* were confirmed, *Athanaſius* and Three other Biſhops declared innocent; and thoſe, who had been placed in their room, not only depoſed, but anathematized, and intirely cut off from the Communion of the Catholic Church [q]. The Council, before they broke up, wrote ſeveral Letters; and, among the reſt, one to the Emperors; one to the Biſhop of *Rome*; and a circular Letter to all the Biſhops of the Catholic Church, acquainting them with what had paſſed, and exhorting them to join the Council, and declare to the World, that they accepted their Decrees by ſubſcribing

The Council of Sardica.

[m] Athan. ib. p. 740--753. [n] Idem ib. p. 761. Socr. l. 1. c. 20. Hil. frag. 2. p. 7. Soz. l. 3. c. 12, &c. [o] Athanaſ. ib. p. 767. [p] Idem ad Solit. p. 819. Hil. frag. 2. p. 22. [q] Athan. ib. p. 766. & ad Sol. p. 820. Theod. l. 2. c. 6. Hil. frag. 1. p. 18.

ſcribing to them[r]. The circular Letter was ſubſcribed firſt by the great *Oſius* Biſhop of *Cordou*, and in the ſecond place by the Pope's Legate[s]. In their Letter to *Julius* they beg him to notify their Decrees to the Biſhops of *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, and *Italy*, leſt any of them ſhould receive Letters of Peace and Communion from the Biſhops they had condemned[t]. In this Letter the Council ſaith, or rather is made to ſay, That *it is very meet or reaſonable, that all Biſhops ſhould acquaint their Head, that is, the See of St.* Peter, *with what paſſeth in their reſpective Provinces*[u]. I agree with *Blondel*[w], that this Paſſage is foiſted in; but cannot acquieſce to the only Reaſon he allegeth to ſupport his Opinion, *viz.* the Barbarity of the *Latin* Expreſſion (*valde congruentiſſimum eſt*); for ſuch a Slip might eaſily eſcape Men wholly bent on defending the Truth, and ſpeaking it; and, beſides, we are not certain that this Letter was originally written in *Latin*. The want of Connection between that Sentence, and what is ſaid both before and after it, is, I think, a more convincing Proof of Forgery.

Canons of the Council of Sardica *relating to the Biſhop of* Rome.

By the Council of *Sardica* ſeveral Canons were made, but I ſhall only take notice of thoſe that regard the Biſhop of *Rome*. By the Third Canon in the *Greek*, or the Fourth in the *Latin* Tranſlation by *Iſidorus*, it is ordered, that if any Biſhop ſhall think himſelf unjuſtly condemned, his Judges ſhall acquaint the Biſhop of *Rome* therewith, who may either confirm the firſt Judgment, or order his Cauſe to be re-examined by ſuch of the neighbouring Biſhops as he ſhall think fit to name[x]. *Oſius*, who was greatly addicted to the See of *Rome*, begged the Council to grant this Honour to the Memory of St. *Peter*. The Fourth Canon, according to the *Greek*, addeth, That the See of the depoſed Biſhop ſhall remain vacant till his Cauſe ſhall be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*. By the

[r] Athan. ib. [s] Idem ib. p. 767. [t] Hil. frag. p. 15, 16.
[u] Id. ib. [w] Blond. prim. p. 106. [x] Concil. t. 2 p. 652.

the Fifth Canon, which, by ſome Miſtake, is the Seventh in *Dionyſius Exiguus*, it is ordered, That if a Biſhop, condemned in his own Province, ſhall chuſe to be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and deſireth him to appoint ſome of his Preſbyters to judge him in his Name, together with the Biſhops, the Biſhop of *Rome* may grant him his Requeſt. Thus was the pernicious Practice of appealing to the Pope firſt introduced and authorized. It muſt be obſerved, that the Oriental Biſhops had all left the Council: thoſe who remained were all zealous Oppoſers of *Arianiſm*. At the Head of their Party was the Biſhop of *Rome*. In the Heat of their Zeal they thought they could not confer too much Power upon him; and ſo made a Conceſſion intirely repugnant to the Diſcipline of the primitive Church, and which he could never have obtained, had not thoſe Diſpoſitions worked ſtrongly in his Favour. This will not be ſurpriſing to thoſe, who have attended to Hiſtory, and ſeen how much the Ambition of Princes and Heads of Factions, is often advanced beyond its due Bounds by the indiſcreet Fervour of Party-Zeal. To the Council of *Sardica*, acting under this Influence, the See of *Rome* is indebted for the ſo much boaſted Privilege of receiving Appeals; and *Julius* was very thankful for it. But his Succeſſors, looking upon ſuch an Obligation as a Diminution of their pretended Sovereignty, have had the Aſſurance to claim it as their original Right: but that ſuch a Right was unknown to their great Friend *Oſius*, to the Fathers of the Council, nay, and to the Pope himſelf and his Legates, is manifeſt, ſince what they now claim as their original and inherent Right, was, by *Oſius*, begged of the Council as a Favour, and, as ſuch, granted by the Council, and accepted by the Pope and his Legates. This Power of receiving Appeals, only with reſpect to the judging and depoſing of Biſhops, hath been extended by the Popes to all Cauſes; and great Encouragement hath been given to ſuch

The Practice of appealing to the Pope firſt introduced.

Several Circumſtances concur in his Favour.

The Popes claim as their original Right what was granted them as a Favour.

ſuch as recurred to their Tribunal on the ſlighteſt Occaſions. *Concerning Appeals in the ſmalleſt Cauſes, we would have you to know, that the ſame Regard is to be had to them, for how a ſlight a Matter ſoever they be made, as if they were for a greater*, ſaith Pope *Alexander* III. in his Letter to the Biſhop of *Worceſtery*. The ſcandalous and intolerable Abuſe of this Power in the Popes hath obliged ſeveral Princes, even when Superſtition moſt prevailed, to reſtrain their Subjects by ſevere Laws from recurring to *Rome*. Nay, other Councils of far greater Authority than that of *Sardica*, finding no other Means to put a Stop to the daily Incroachments of the See of *Rome*, have thought it neceſſary to revoke the Privilege, which that Council had too raſhly granted, as we ſhall ſee in the Sequel of the preſent Hiſtory.

Decrees of the Council of Antioch *revoked by the Council of* Sardica.

It had been decreed but Six Years before, by the Council of *Antioch*, that if the Biſhops of the ſame Province diſagreed in judging one of their Brethren, the Metropolitan might call in thoſe of the neighbouring Province to judge with them; but if they agreed, and were unanimous either in condemning or abſolving, their Judgment ſhould be irreverſible. Both theſe Decrees were revoked by the preſent Council, though intirely agreeable to the antient Practice and Diſcipline of the Church. But yet this Council, however favourable to the Pope, did not grant him the Power of ſummoning Biſhops to *Rome*, in order to be judged there by him. He was only impowered to examine the Judgment given in the Province; and, in caſe he found it to be wrong, to order another in the ſame Province, to invite to this new Synod the Biſhops of the next Province, and to ſend his Legates to it as he thought fit.

The Pope hath no Power to ſummond Biſhops to Rome.

Oſius did not preſide at the Council of

At this Council the Pope's Legates aſſiſted; but *Oſius* preſided, as we are told in expreſs Terms by *Theo-*

y In decret. Gregor. l. 2. tit. 28. c. 11.

Sardica *as the Pope's Legate.*

Theodoret [z], by *Sozomen* [a], and by the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* [b]. Besides, his Name is the first in the Subscriptions, as they have been transmitted to us by *Athanasius*, who assureth us, that *Osius* was the Chief, and presided in all the Councils at which he assisted. He signed the first, and in his own Name; after him signed the Legates, not in their own, but in the Pope's Name; *Julius Romæ per Archidamum & Philoxenum Presbyteros*; which is a sufficient Confutation of *De Marca*, and the other Popish Writers, pretending, without the least Foundation, that *Osius* presided in the Name of *Julius*.

The Council of Sardica *a Council of no great Authority.*

It is to be observed, that the Canons of this Council were never received in the East, nor even in the West by the Bishops of *Africa*; and that they were not inserted by the Council of *Chalcedon* into the Code of Canons approved by them, as Rules to be universally observed: so that, after all, the so much boasted Council of *Sardica* is a Council of no great Authority. Of this the Popes themselves were well apprised; and therefore, recurring to Fraud, attempted, as we shall see hereafter, to impose upon the World the Canons of *Sardica* as the Canons of *Nice*.

Athanasius *retireth to* Naissus.

Athanasius, though declared innocent by the Council, did not think it adviseable to return to his See, being informed, that the *Eusebians* had prevailed upon the Emperor *Constantius* to issue an Order, impowering and commanding the Magistrates of *Alexandria* to put him to Death, without further Tryal, in what Place soever he should be found within the Precincts of that Jurisdiction [c]. He therefore retired to *Naissus* in *Upper Dacia*, and there continued from the Year 347 to 349, when *Constantius* chose rather to recall him, and the other exiled Bishops, than engage in a Civil War, with which he was threaten-

Is called by Constantius.

[z] Theodoret. l. 2. c. 15. [a] Sozom. l. 3. c. 11. [b] Concil. l. 4. p. 825. [c] Athan. apol. 2. p. 271. & ad Sol. p. 820.

threatened by his Brother, if he did not [d]. Before his Departure for the East he went to *Rome*, to take his Leave of that Church, and his great Protector *Julius*, who, on that Occasion, wrote an excellent Letter of Congratulation to the Presbyters, Deacons, and People of *Alexandria*. Of this Letter we have Two Copies, the one in *Socrates* [e], and the other in *Athanasius* [f]. The former containeth great Commendations of that Prelate, which, out of Modesty, were, as I conjecture, omitted by him.

Julius had, soon after, the Satisfaction of receiving a solemn Retractation made by *Ursacius* Bishop of *Singidunum*, and *Valens* Bishop of *Mursus*, Two of *Athanasius*'s most inveterate Enemies, publicly owning, that whatever they had said or wrote against him was utterly false, groundless, and invented out of pure Malice: at the same Time they embraced his Communion, and anathematized the Heresy of *Arius*, and all who held or defended his Tenets. This Act *Valens* wrote with his own Hand, and *Ursacius* signed it; whereupon they were both admitted by *Julius* to the Communion of the Church [g] (A). This Retractation, though not at all sincere, but merely owe-

Ursacius and Valens retract all they had said against Athanasius.

ing

[d] Idem ad Sol. p. 822. Ruf. l. 1. c. 19. Theod. l. 2. c. 6. [e] Socr. l. 2. c. 23. [f] Athan. apol. 2. p. 770. [g] Athan. ad Solit. p. 826. & Apol. 2. p. 776. Hil. frag. 1. p. 24--26.

(A) *Ursacius* and *Valens* first abjured, or rather pretended to abjure, their Errors at *Milan*, before the Council, that at this Time was sitting there. From *Milan* they repaired to *Rome*, and there abjured anew their Errors, in the Presence of *Julius*, and the whole *Roman* Church. Here *Baronius* observes, *that as this was a Matter of too great Moment to be finally decided by the Council of* Milan, *though the* Roman *Presbyters were present, they sent them to* Julius, *that they might abjure their Errors in his Presence, agreeably to the antient Custom of the Catholic Church*; viz. *that eminent Heretics should abjure their Heresies only at* Rome (1). But, in the first Place, they were not sent by the Council; but went to *Rome* of their own Accord, as *Osius* assureth us, in express Terms,

(1) Bar. ad ann. 350. n. 23.

ing to Policy, greatly contributed to the Justification of *Athanasius*. I find nothing else in the Antients, concerning *Julius*, worthy of Notice. He died on the 12th of *April* 352, having governed the Church of *Rome* Fifteen Years, Two Months, and Six Days[f]. He is said to have been buried in the Cœmetery of *Callistus*, on the *Aurelian* Way, where he had built a Church[g], and to have been removed from thence in 817 by Pope *Paschal* I. to the Church of St. *Praxedes*; and again from that, by *Innocent* II. in 1140, to St. *Mary*'s beyond the *Tyber*[h]. *Bede*, whom the Authors of the modern Pontificals have followed, telleth us, in his Martyrology[i], that *Julius* was sent into Banishment, where he suffer much for the Space

Julius *dieth.*

[f] Buch. cycl. 267, 273. [g] Idem ib. [h] Bolland. 12 Apr. p. 86. n. 14. [i] Bed. martyr. p. 83.

Terms, *Illi ultro Roman venerunt* (2). In the second Place, the Matter was finally determined by the Council of *Milan*; for the Council received their Recantation, and restored them to the Communion of the Church. And what else was to be done? what else could *Julius* do? But if the Matter was finally determined by the Council, what could induce them, saith *Baronius*, to travel to *Rome*, and abjure anew their Heresy there? The Answer is obvious: They had imposed upon the Council by a pretended Abjuration, and went to *Rome*, to impose, in like manner, on *Julius*, and obtain by that means his Communion; which they did accordingly, notwithstanding his *Infallibility*. Besides, as both *Athanasius* and his Enemies had referred their Cause to the Arbitration of *Julius*, he was the fittest Person to receive the Retractation of the false Evidence, which they had formerly given. As to the Custom, mentioned by *Baronius*, that *eminent Heretics should abjure their Heresies only at* Rome, no Man can be so little versed in ecclesiastical History, as not to know, that no such Custom ever obtained in the Catholic Church. Not to recur to more antient Times, the *Arian* Bishops, that is, Bishops guilty of the same Heresy as *Ursacius* and *Valens*, abjured their Errors before the Council that was held at *Jerusalem* in 335. There they renounced their Heresy; there they were all restored to the Communion of the Church, without going, or offering to go, to *Rome*. And many of those Bishops were surely more eminent Heretics than either *Ursacius* or *Valens*.

(2) Apud Athan. ad Solitar.

Space of Ten Months, till the Death of *Conſtantius*, a zealous Promoter of *Arianiſm*. But that Hiſtorian was certainly miſtaken, ſince *Conſtantius* was never Maſter of *Rome* in *Julius*'s Time, and his Brother *Conſtans* was a great Friend to *Julius*, and all the orthodox Biſhops. Of the many Writings aſcribed to *Julius*, none, except his Two Letters, are authentic, the one to the *Euſebians*, and the other to the Church of *Alexandria*, of which we have ſpoken above. *Leontius* of *Byzantium* mentioned Seven Epiſtles, which, in the latter End of the Sixth Century, were aſcribed to *Julius* [k]; but, at the ſame time, he aſſureth us, that they were not wrote by him, but by *Apollinaris* the Hereſiarch; and the Monks of *Palæſtine*, in the Account they gave of the *Eutychians*, in the Time of the Emperor *Anaſtaſius*, aſſure us, that they ſeduced great Numbers of People, by aſcribing the Works of *Apollinaris* to the Fathers, namely to *Athanaſius*, to *Gregory Nazianzene*, and to *Julius* [l]. *Gennadius* aſcribeth to *Julius* a Letter to *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Corinth*, greatly ſavouring of the Hereſy of *Eutyches* and *Timotheus* [m]; but *Leontius* of *Byzantium* evidently proves that Letter to have been wrote by *Apollinaris*; and as his it is quoted by his Two Diſciples *Valentine* and *Timotheus* [n]. The Orientals have a Liturgy, which they ſuppoſe to have been compoſed by *Julius*: this Suppoſition, however groundleſs, ſheweth him to have been in great Repute in thoſe Parts [o].

Julius was not baniſhed by Conſtantius.

Spurious Pieces aſcribed to him.

[k] Leont. ſect. 8. p. 526. [l] Evagr. l. 3. c. 31. [m] Gen. c. 2. [n] Leont. ib. [o] Bona lit. l. 1. c. 9. p. 64.

LIBE-

CONSTANTIUS, JULIAN, **LIBERIUS,** JOVIAN, VALERIAN.

Thirty-fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 352. *LIBERIUS* was chosen on the 22d of *May* 352, in the room of *Julius* P. He had trampled under-foot (to use his own Terms) all worldly things, to observe the Gospel, and obey the Dictates of his Faith. He had been employed, before his Election, in several ecclesiastical Ministries, and discharged them with Reputation, though he was not conscious to himself of having ever done the least thing for the sake of Praise and Glory. He was at last raised to the episcopal Dignity, but much against his Will, as he calleth God and the Church to witness. He protesteth, that it was his ardent and only Wish, that he might keep himself pure and undefiled in the Administration of his new Dignity, that he might inviolably maintain and defend the Faith, which he had received from his illustrious Predecessors, among who were many Martyrs q. Were we to judge of his Conduct from his Words, we should equal him to the best of his Predecessors; but there appeareth, throughout his whole Administration, such an odd Mixture of opposite Qualities, that it is no easy Matter to form a true Idea of his Character: at one time we shall find him bold, intrepid, and inflexible; at another timorous, faint-hearted, and compliant; insomuch that one can hardly conceive him to be the same Man. The latter Qualities he betrayed in the very Beginning of his Pontificate, by separating himself from the Communion of *Athanasius*. *Constans*, the great Support of the orthodox Party, being murdered, and *Constantius* upon the Point of becoming Master of *Rome*. by

Liberius *his own Penegyrist.*

No easy Matter to form a true Idea of his Character.

P Buch. cycl. p. 273. q Hil. frag. 2. p. 41.

by a complete Victory he had gained over the Two Brothers, *Magnentius* and *Decentius*, the *Eusebians* thought this a proper Juncture to try whether the Fear of that Prince had not rendered *Julius* somewhat more tractable. For *Constantius* was more incenſed than ever againſt *Athanaſius*, being aſſured by the *Euſebians*, to whom he gave an intire Credit, that he had influenced his Brother to threaten him with a Civil War [q]. They wrote therefore to *Julius* a ſecond Letter, filled with new Complaints and Calumnies againſt *Athanaſius*; but *Julius* dying in the mean time, their Letter, together with another to the ſame Purpoſe from the *Arians* of *Alexandria*, was delivered to *Liberius*, who cauſed them both to be publicly read in a full Aſſembly of the People, and in the Council, which was then ſitting at *Rome* [r]. His Anſwer to theſe Letters hath not reached our Times; but a Copy of the Letter, which he wrote on that Occaſion to *Athanaſius*, hath, to his eternal Diſgrace, been tranſmitted to us among the Fragments of *Hilarius* Biſhop of *Poitiers*. In that Letter he ſummoneth him to appear forthwith at *Rome*, to clear himſelf there of the heavy Accuſations brought againſt him; and threateneth to cut him off from the Communion of that Church, if he refuſed to comply with the Summons [s]. With this Letter he diſpatched Three of his Preſbyters, *Lucius*, *Paulus*, and *Ælianus*, ſtrictly injoining them, by all means, to prevail upon *Athanaſius* to repair without Delay, to *Rome* [t]. This Conduct ſo very different from that of his Predeceſſor, was, no doubt, owing to the Dread he was in of the Emperor *Conſtantius*, by this Time probably Maſter of *Rome*, and all *Italy*; for what elſe could tempt or induce him to act ſo prepoſterouſly? be that as it will, *Athanaſius* was greatly

The Euſebians *write a ſecond Letter* to Julius, *againſt* Athanaſius:

Which is anſwered by Liberius.

who ſummoneth Athanaſius *to* Rome.

[q] Athan. ad Sol. p. 828, & Apol. 2. p. 674. Theod. l. 2. c. 10.
[r] Hil. frag. 1 p. 36, 40. [s] Idem ib. [t] Idem ib.

CONSTANTIUS, JULIAN, **LIBERIUS,** JOVIAN, VALERIAN.

Thirty-fifth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 352. *LIBERIUS* was chosen on the 22d of *May* 352, in the room of *Julius* P. He had trampled under-foot (to use his own Terms) all worldly things, to observe the Gospel, and obey the Dictates of his Faith. He had been employed, before his Election, in several ecclesiastical Ministries, and discharged them with Reputation, though he was not conscious to himself of having ever done the least thing for the sake of Praise and Glory. He was at last raised to the episcopal Dignity, but much against his Will, as he calleth God and the Church to witness. He protesteth, that it was his ardent and only Wish, that he might keep himself pure and undefiled in the Administration of his new Dignity, that he might inviolably maintain and defend the Faith, which he had received from his illustrious Predecessors, among who were many Martyrs q. Were we to judge of his Conduct from his Words, we should equal him to the best of his Predecessors; but there appeareth, throughout his whole Administration, such an odd Mixture of opposite Qualities, that it is no easy Matter to form a true Idea of his Character: at one time we shall find him bold, intrepid, and inflexible; at another timorous, faint-hearted, and compliant; insomuch that one can hardly conceive him to be the same Man. The latter Qualities he betrayed in the very Beginning of his Pontificate, by separating himself from the Communion of *Athanasius*. *Constans*, the great Support of the orthodox Party, being murdered, and *Constantius* upon the Point of becoming Master of *Rome*. by

Liberius *his own Penegyrist.*

No easy Matter to form a true Idea of his Character.

P Buch. cycl. p. 273. q Hil. frag. 2. p. 41.

by a complete Victory he had gained over the Two Brothers, *Magnentius* and *Decentius*, the *Eusebians* thought this a proper Juncture to try whether the Fear of that Prince had not rendered *Julius* somewhat more tractable. For *Constantius* was more incenſed than ever againſt *Athanaſius*, being aſſured by the *Euſebians*, to whom he gave an intire Credit, that he had influenced his Brother to threaten him with a Civil War [q]. They wrote therefore to *Julius* a ſecond Letter, filled with new Complaints and Calumnies againſt *Athanaſius*; but *Julius* dying in the mean time, their Letter, together with another to the ſame Purpoſe from the *Arians* of *Alexandria*, was delivered to *Liberius*, who cauſed them both to be publicly read in a full Aſſembly of the People, and in the Council, which was then ſitting at *Rome* [r]. His Anſwer to theſe Letters hath not reached our Times; but a Copy of the Letter, which he wrote on that Occaſion to *Athanaſius*, hath, to his eternal Diſgrace, been tranſmitted to us among the Fragments of *Hilarius* Biſhop of *Poitiers*. In that Letter he ſummoneth him to appear forthwith at *Rome*, to clear himſelf there of the heavy Accuſations brought againſt him; and threateneth to cut him off from the Communion of that Church, if he refuſed to comply with the Summons [s]. With this Letter he diſpatched Three of his Preſbyters, *Lucius*, *Paulus*, and *Ælianus*, ſtrictly injoining them, by all means, to prevail upon *Athanaſius* to repair without Delay, to *Rome* [t]. This Conduct ſo very different from that of his Predeceſſor, was, no doubt, owing to the Dread he was in of the Emperor *Conſtantius*, by this Time probably Maſter of *Rome*, and all *Italy*; for what elſe could tempt or induce him to act ſo prepoſterouſly? be that as it will, *Athanaſius* was greatly

The Euſebians *write a ſecond Letter* to Julius, *againſt* Athanaſius:

Which is anſwered by Liberius.

who ſummoneth Athanaſius *to* Rome.

[q] Athan. ad Sol. p. 828, & Apol. 2. p. 674. Theod. l. 2. c. 10.
[r] Hil. frag. 1 p. 36, 40. [s] Idem ib. [t] Idem ib.

greatly surprised and concerned to find himself so unworthily treated and threatened by the Bishop of *Rome*; but did not think himself, on that Account, obliged to abandon his Flock. He remained therefore in *Alexandria*; but begged his Collegues in *Egypt* to write in his Favour to the Pope; which they did accordingly. But *Liberius* wanted to ingratiate himself with the *Arians*, and, by their means, with the Emperor; and therefore, without any Regard to the Testimony of the orthodox Bishops, or the known Innocence of the oppressed *Athanasius*, he wrote to the *Eusebians*, acquainting them, that he communicated with them; but, as to *Athanasius*, he had cut him off from his communion, and from that of his Church [u]. *Baronius* [w], and after him the *Benedictines*, in their last Edition of the Works of *Hilarius* and *Athanasius* [x], maintain this Letter of *Liberius* to have been forged by the *Arians*, and inserted into the Works of *Hilarius*. But they allege no convincing Reason, why the other Pieces, among which it hath been conveyed to us, should be admitted as genuine, and this alone rejected as suppositious. *Athanasius*, indeed, never reproached the Bishop of *Rome* with his scandalous Conduct, as they observe: but may not that be ascribed to his Moderation? The more, as he was sensible, that *Liberius* acted thus not out of Ill-will, but Fear. As to the Want of Connection between that Letter and the Pieces preceding and following it, I should not have expected such an Objection from any who had ever perused the Fragments of that Writer, which every one knoweth to have been patched together without any regard to Time or Order (A).

Liberius communicateth with the Arians, and excommunicateth Athanasius.

His Letter to them not suppositious.

In

[u] Hil. frag. 1. p. 36, 40. [w] Baron. ad ann. 352. n. 12--20.
[x] Hil. p. 1327. & Athan. vit. p. 51.

(A) Thus the very Letter of *Liberius* is put in the Place where the Letter of the Council of *Sardica* to the Emperor *Constantius* ought to have been, as is manifest from what is said immediately before

In the mean time *Conſtantius*, now in Poſſeſſion of the whole Empire by the Death of *Magnentius*, who, after his Defeat, had laid violent Hands on himſelf, ſummoned a Council to meet at *Arles*. At this Council *Liberius*, did not aſſiſt in Perſon, but by his Legates, *Vincentius* Biſhop of *Capua*, and *Marcellus* Biſhop of *Campania*, who, together with ſome others, had been ſent by *Liberius* ſome time before to meet the Emperor at *Arles*, and beg him in the Pope's Name to aſſemble a Council at *Aquileia* y. As the Biſhop of *Capua* was a Man of great Parts, and long Experience, *Liberius* repoſed an entire Confidence in him, not doubting but he would maintain the Dignity of his Legation, and ſupport the Innocency of *Athanaſius* with that firmneſs which he had ſhewn on ſeveral Occaſions (B). *The Council of Arles.*

As

y Athan. ad Solit. p. 829. Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 159. Hilar. frag. 2. p. 41, 47.

before it. A few Lines after, inſtead of the Letter from the Council of *Egypt* to *Liberius*, which *Hilarius* promiſeth, we find one from *Liberius* to the Biſhops of *Italy*, written after the Death of *Conſtantius* upon a quite different Subject. What cometh immediately after the Letter of *Liberius* to the *Euſebians*, ought in all Likelihood, to have been placed after the above-mentioned Letter of the Council of *Sardica* to *Conſtantius*: for to me it appeareth no leſs improbable than it doth or can do to *Baronius* (1), that *Hilarius*, a moſt zealous Stickler for the orthodox Faith, ſhould approve of the Pope's ſcandalous Letter, tending utterly to ſubvert it, and expreſs his Approbation in theſe Terms; *What is there in this Letter that is not holy? What is there that doth not proceed from the Fear of God?* However, I cannot conclude, and much leſs demonſtratively, with the Annaliſt, that the Letter hath been forged by the *Arians*. All I think can be inferred from thence is, that the Letters, like moſt other Pieces there, have been miſplaced; and that the above-mentioned Words of *Hilarius* ought to be put after the Letter of the Council to *Conſtantius*, and not after that of *Liberius* to the *Arians*.

(B) For *Liberius*, aſhamed of what he had done againſt *Athanaſius*, not only re-admitted him ſoon after to his Communion, but with great Zeal undertook his Defence.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 352. n. 13.

As the Council consisted chiefly of *Arians*, their great Point in view was, to extort from the *Italian* Bishops a solemn Condemnation of *Athanasius*. This therefore was in the first place proposed in the Council; and, because the orthodox Bishops would not consent to it, an Edict was issued by the Emperor sentencing all those to Exile who should refuse to sign the Condemnation of *Athanasius*[a]. The boasted Firmness and Constancy of *Vincentius* were not Proof against such a Trial. He did all that lay in his Power to divert the Emperor from the Execution of a Decree utterly inconsistent with the Liberty of a Council; but finding him deaf to all Remonstrances, he began to capitulate, offering to sign the Condemnation of *Athanasius*, on condition the *Eusebians* signed that of *Arius*, and publicly abjured his Doctrine. This he thought would be some Alleviation of his Guilt, and therefore the Proposal which he had made by Word of Mouth he gave in Writing to the Heads of the *Arian* Faction, signed by himself and his Fellow-Legates. But the *Arians*, too well acquainted with their Weakness to grant them any Terms, peremptorily insisted upon the ircondemning *Athanasius*, and referring the Cause and Doctrine of *Arius* to a more proper Juncture. *Vincentius* and his Collegues, finding the Enemies of *Athanasius* thus inflexible, and, on the other hand, determined at all Events to keep their Bishopricks, and avoid the Hardships of a painful Exile, complied at last, and *yielded to the troublesome times*, to use their softening Expression[b]. They were the more inexcusable, as they had before their Eyes the Example of a great Prelate, whose Constancy was proof against all the Threats and Menaces of a provoked Prince. This was the celebrated *Paulinus* Bishop of *Treves*, who, after perusing the Formulary, drawn up by the *Eusebians*,

The Emperor's Edict.

The Pope's Legates sign the Condemnation of Athanasius.

[a] Sulp. Sever. l 2. p 159. [b] Hil. frag. 2. p. 42. Athan. ap. 1. p. 691. Theod. l. 2. c. 17.

ſebians, to be ſigned by him and the other Biſhops, rejected it with the utmoſt Indignation, declaring that nothing they could do ſhould ever induce him to betray the Truth, and his own Conſcience, by ſetting his Hand to ſuch a ſcandalous Piece. The *Euſebians* left no Art unattempted to gain him, as they had done the Pope's Legates; but finding he was a Man of a quite different Diſpoſition, and deſpairing of being ever able to prevail upon him either by Hopes or Fear, they at laſt had recourſe to the Emperor, who, putting his Decree in Execution, ſent him into Exile; and, in order to tire out his Patience, ordered him to be conſtantly conveyed from one inhoſpitable Place to another. But in every Place *Paulinus* was the ſame, the Conſcience of his ſuffering for the ſake of Juſtice enabling him to bear, not only with Patience, but Chearfulneſs, the inexpreſſible Hardſhips he underwent [c]. He died in *Phrygia* in the fifth Year of his Exile [d], that is, in 358. But his Body is ſuppoſed to have been diſcovered in a Church of his Name at *Treves*, in the Year 1071 [e]. How and when it was conveyed thither, let thoſe inquire who adore it.

The glorious Behaviour of Paulinus.

To return to *Liberius*, he was ſo ſenſibly affected with the Fall of *Vincentius* and his Collegues, that he wiſhed for an Opportunity of loſing his life in ſo good a Cauſe, and waſhing out with his Blood the Stain which the ſcandalous Conduct of his Legates had brought upon his Character [f]. Thus he expreſſeth himſelf in the Letter, which he wrote on that Occaſion to the great Friend of his See, *Oſius* [g]. However, in the Height of his Affliction, he found great Relief in the Courage and Steadineſs of *Cæcilianus* Biſhop of *Spoleto*, of *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Vercelli*,

[c] Hil. frag. 1. p. 6. & in Conſ. l. 2. p. 119. Sulp. Sever. p. 157. Athan. in Ar. orat. 1. p. 291. ad Solit. p. 381. de fug. 703.
[d] Sulp. Sever. p. 169. Hier. chron. [e] Bar. in martyr. 31 Aug.
[f] Hil. frag. 47. [g] Id. ib.

celli, and of *Lucifer* Biſhop of *Cagliari* in *Sardinia*. The latter adviſed the Pope to demand of the Emperor another Council, and generouſly took upon himſelf to go to *Arles*, where *Conſtantius* then was, and make that Demand. *Liberius* readily accepted his Offer, and named *Pancratius* and *Hilarius* for his Collegues, the one a Preſbyter, the other a Deacon, of the Church of *Rome*. By theſe he wrote an excellent Letter to the Emperor, wherein, with the Liberty that became a Catholic Biſhop, but at the ſame time with all the Reſpect that is due from a Subject to his Sovereign, he juſtifieth his Conduct in the Defence of *Athanaſius*, layeth open the Arts and Views of the adverſe Party, and begs that a new Council might be aſſembled, there being no other Means to put a Stop to ſo many Evils, and reſtore Peace and Tranquillity to the Catholic Church [h]. At the ſame time *Liberius* wrote to *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Vercelli*, and *Fortunatianus* Biſhop of *Aquileia*, intreating them to aſſiſt his Legates with their Advice, and even with their Preſence, ſhould it be thought neceſſary. The Three Legates, on their Arrival at *Vercelli*, in their Way to *Arles*, were not only kindly received, but joined by *Euſebius*, who repaired with them to the Emperor. As the *Arians* were no-ways averſe to the Propoſal, nay, had even ſollicited the Emperor to convene a new Council, the Requeſt of the Legates met with no Difficulty; ſo that a Council was appointed to meet at *Milan*, where it met accordingly in the Beginning of the Year 355 [i]. We are told, that it conſiſted of Three hundred Weſtern Biſhops, and that from the Eaſt there came but very few [k]. But *Conſtantius* and his Army may be ſaid to have ſupplied their room. For the Council no ſooner met, than the Emperor abſolutely inſiſted upon their ſigning

Liberius writeth to the Emperor for another Council;

which is granted, and aſſembleth at Milan.

[h] Hil. frag. 47. p. 39, 43. [i] Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 159. Hil. frag. 2. p. 43. Athanaſ. ad Solit. p. 146, [k] Soz. p. 546, 547. Socr. l. 2. c. 36

ing the Condemnation of *Athanasius*, and an Edict, containing the chief Tenets of *Arius*, which had been published in his Name. But in this Attempt he met with a vigorous Opposition from *Dionysius* Bishop of *Milan*, *Eusebius* of *Vercelli*, *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, and the Two other Legates, *Pancratius* and *Hilarius*; which provoked him to such a Degree, that he was upon the Point of commanding them to be executed upon the Spot as Rebels. But, upon second Thoughts, he contented himself with sending them into Exile, *Dionysius* into *Cappadocia*, or *Armenia*, where he died a few Years after, *Eusebius* to *Sythopolis* in *Palæstine*, and *Lucifer* to *Germanicia* in *Syria*. To what Place *Pancratius* and *Hilarius* were confined, we know not; but the latter was most cruelly whipt before he was banished [l]. As for the other Bishops, I shall only say, with *Ruffinus* [m], that, out of Three hundred, *Dionysius*, *Lucifer*, and *Eusebius*, alone shewed a Firmness and Intrepidity becoming Men of their Rank and Dignity. Among the rest *Fortunatianus* Bishop of *Aquileia* signed the Condemnation of *Athanasius*; which greatly added to the Grief and Concern of *Liberius*, who, till that Time, had entertained the highest Opinion of him.

Some Bishops banished.

And now *Constantius* had the Satisfaction of seeing *Athanasius* condemned by the far greater Part of the Western Bishops. But the Bishop of *Rome* still declared openly in his Favour, and did all that lay in his Power to gain others to his Party. To deprive him therefore of so powerful a Protector, the Emperor resolved to spare no Cost nor Labour. With this View he dispatched to *Rome* the Eunuch *Eusebius* his great Chamberlain, with rich Presents in one Hand, and a threatening Letter in the other; but with an invincible Firmness *Liberius* withstood both; so that the Eunuch, who was himself a sworn Enemy to *Atha-*

Constantius endeavoureth in vain to gain Liberius;

[l] Athan. ad Solit. p. 838. [m] Ruff. l. 1. c. 20.

Athanasius, returned to Court baffled and disappointed; and there, by the Account he gave of his unsuccessful Embassy, added new Fuel to the Fire which burnt already with great Violence. The Emperor, who pretended to govern the Church no less despotically than he did the State, transported with Rage at the stout Opposition he met with from the Bishop of *Rome*, immediately dispatched an Order to *Leontius*, Prefect of that City, injoining him to apprehend *Liberius*, and send him under a strong Guard to Court. Pursuant to this Order, *Liberius* was seized in the Night-time, lest the People by whom he was greatly beloved, should attempt his Rescue, and conveyed to *Milan*, where the Court then resided [n]. Soon after his Arrival he was brought before the Emperor, when, undaunted and unawed by the Presence of so great a Prince, he spoke with all the Liberty of an Apostle, and with all the Eloquence of a great Orator [o]. At this Interview were present *Eusebius* the Eunuch, and *Epictetus* Bishop of *Centumcellæ*, now *Civitta-Vecchia*, who, for his ready Compliance with the Emperor's Will, had been raised by him to great Preferments [p]. The latter told *Liberius*, when he had ended the excellent Speech he made before the Emperor, that he had indeed expressed great Zeal for the Purity of the Faith, and the Liberty of Councils; but the Whole was mere Mummery; and that he only wanted to be looked upon by his Party as a Person of some Significancy, and to brag among the Senators, on his Return to *Rome* that he had had the Honour to dispute with the Emperor [q]. The Eunuch too thought he must speak, but it was only to betray his Ignorance; for he reproached *Liberius* with defending *Athanasius*, who had been condemned,

who is sent Prisoner to **Milan.**

His Interview with the Emperor,

[n] Athan. ad Solit. p. 833, 834. Ammian. l. 15. p. 47. Theod. l. 2. c. 13. & l. 15. p. 38, 41, 47. [o] Athanas. & Theod. ibid. [p] Athan. in Ar. or. 1. p. 290. Marcell. & Faustin. lib. prec. ad Theod. p. 30. [q] Theod. l. 2. c. 13.

ed, he ſaid, as an Heretic, by the Council of *Nice* [r]. As for *Conſtantius*, the only Reply he made to the Reaſons alleged by *Liberius* in favour of *Athanaſius*, and the Faith of *Nice*, was, that the wicked and impious *Athanaſius*, as he ſtyled him, had been condemned by the whole World; that, by his arrogant Conduct, he had provoked all Mankind, and himſelf in particular, by conſtantly ſtirring up his Brother againſt him; and therefore he looked upon the Defeat of *Magnentius* and *Sylvanus*, who had attempted to bereave him of his Crown, as leſs important to him than the depoſing and condemning of a Man, by whom he had been ſo highly injured [s]. In Anſwer to this, *Liberius* begged, that, of all Men, he would not chuſe Biſhops for the Inſtruments of his private Revenge. *Conſtantius* made no Reply, but only told him, that he muſt either ſign the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, or be ſent into Exile; and that he allowed him Three Days to deliberate which of the Two he would chuſe. *Liberius* anſwered, with great Intrepidity, that he had already choſen, and was reſolved; that in Three Days he ſhould not change his Reſolution; and therefore the Emperor might ſend him that Minute to what Place ſoever he pleaſed [t]. The Three Days were not yet expired when the Emperor ſent for him anew to Court, hoping the Fear of Baniſhment had ſoftened him, as it had done moſt others, into a Compliance. But he found him unalterably fixed in the ſame Reſolution; and therefore, deſpairing of being ever able to ſucceed in his attempt, he ordered him to be conveyed forthwith to *Beræa* in *Thrace* [u]. *Liberius* had not yet left the Palace, when the Emperor ſent him a Preſent of Five hundred Pieces of Gold to defray his Charges; which he ſent back by the ſame Perſon who brought them, ſaying, that the Emperor might

His Steadineſs.

He is baniſhed to Beræa *in* Thrace.

[r] Theod. l. 2. c. 13. [s] Idem ibidem. [t] Idem ibidem.
[u] Id. ib. & Athan. ad Solit. p. 835.

might want Money to pay his Troops. The like Sum was sent him by the Empress *Eusebia*; which, with the same Answer, he desired might be conveyed to the Emperor, adding, that if he knew not how to employ that Sum better, he might bestow it on *Epictetus*, or *Auxentius* the *Arian* Bishop of *Milan*, who would be very thankful for it [x]. He left *Milan* Three Days after, and set out for the Place of his Exile. His Fate was no sooner known at *Rome*, than the Clergy assembling the People, bound themselves by a solemn Oath, in their Presence, not to acknowlege any other for their Bishop so long as *Liberius* lived [y].

Felix is chosen in his room.

Liberius being thus driven from his See, another was placed on it in his room; and the Person, whom the Emperor and the *Arian* Faction pitched upon, was one *Felix*, then only Deacon of the Church of *Rome* [a]. But the Clergy could not proceed to a new Election, without an open Violation of the Oath they had taken; the People began to mutiny, and, assembling in Crouds, would suffer none of the *Arian* Faction to enter their Churches. The Imperial Palace therefore served instead of a Church; Three of the Emperor's Eunuchs represented the People; and Three Bishops Slaves of the Court, *viz.* *Epictetus* of *Centumcellæ*, *Acacius* of *Cæsarea*, and *Easilius* of *Ancyra*, ordained the new-elected Bishop [b]. Thus was *Felix* chosen, and thus ordained. As *Liberius* was greatly beloved by the People, chiefly on account of his vigorous Opposition to *Constantius*, the Intrusion of *Felix* occasioned a great Sedition, in which many lost their Lives [c]. The Clergy were not so zealous in the Cause as the People; for great Numbers of them, unmindful of the Oath they had taken, were by

[x] Theod. l. 2. c. 13. Soz. l. 4. c. 11. [y] Marc. & Faust. &c. p. 3. Hier. chron. [a] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861. Ruff. l. 1. c. 22. [b] Athan. ibid. Hier. ep. 98. Soz. l. 4. c. 24. Socr. l. 2. c. 37. [c] Soz. l. 4. c. 15.

by Degrees reconciled to *Felix*, and communicated with him [d]; whereas the People continued to abhor and avoid him at leaſt till the Year 357, when *Conſtantius* came to *Rome* [e]; For that Prince being deſirous to ſee the Metropolis of his Empire, undertook a Journey to *Rome* in the above-mentioned Year, and entered it in triumph on the 28th of *April* [f]. During his ſhort Stay in that City, the *Roman* Ladies gave a ſignal Inſtance of the Zeal and Affection they ſtill retained for their exiled Biſhop. They thought a more favourable Opportunity could never offer to ſolicit the Emperor for his Return; and therefore, by a private Agreement among themſelves, they preſſed their Huſbands, with great Earneſtneſs, to lay hold of it, threatening to abandon them, if they did not, and repair to their Biſhop to ſhare with him the Hardſhips of his Exile. The Huſbands, unmoved by ſuch Menaces, which they well knew would never take place, anſwered, that by ſuch an Application they might incur the Diſpleaſure of the Prince, which would prove fatal to them, as well as to the Perſon in whoſe Behalf they interpoſed; whereas, ſhould they themſelves take ſuch a pious and commendable Office upon them, the Reſpect due to their Sex would, in all Likelihood, extort from the Prince the deſired Favour, at leaſt it would reſtrain his Reſentment, and ſtifle all Thoughts of Revenge. The Propoſal was univerſally applauded by the Ladies, unwilling to expoſe their Huſbands to the dire Effects of the Emperor's Indignation. On an appointed Day therefore, attiring themſelves in an Apparel ſuitable to their Rank, that the Emperor in ſeeing them might know who they were, and treat them accordingly, they repaired to Court; and being immediately admitted to

Conſtantius goeth to Rome.

The Roman *Ladies intercede for* Liberius.

[d] Hier. chron. Marc. & Fauſt. p. 3. [e] Athan. ad Sol. p. 861, Theod. l. 2. c. 14. Ammian. l. 16. p. 72. [f] Ammian. l. 16. p. 69, 72. Idat. chron. Alex.

to the Prince's Presence, they conjured him, with Tears in their Eyes, to take Pity of that great City, of that numerous Flock, bereft of its Pastor, and, in his Absence, devoured by ravenous Wolves. This was not at all a courtly Language; however, *Constantius*, without betraying the least emotion, said, *I thought you had a Pastor, is not* Felix *as capable of discharging the Pastoral Office as any other?* Felix replied they, *is detested, and avoided by all.* At these Words the Emperor first looked grave; but, immediately changing his Gravity into a Smile, *If so*, said he, with great Complaisance, *you must have* Liberius *again: I shall, without Delay, dispatch the proper Orders for his Return.* An Edict was accordingly issued the very next Day, recalling *Liberius* to govern the Church jointly with *Felix*: for *Constantius* thought it inconsistent with his Honour, and the Imperial Dignity, to drive *Felix* from the See, on which he himself had placed him.

The Emperor promiseth to recall him.

The Edict recalling him to govern jointly with Felix, *rallied by the* Roman *People.*

When this Edict was read, in the Presence of the Emperor, to the People assembled in the *Circus*, they applauded it at first, by way of Raillery, saying, That since the Spectators, at the public Sports, were divided into two Parties, it was just and reasonable there should be Two Bishops to head them. The Multitude, not satisfied with thus pleasantly expressing their Dissatisfaction, cried out, immediately after, with one Voice, *There is but One God, One Christ, one Bishop* [g]. And yet the Emperor was rather delighted than displeased with the Humour of the People, and the Liberty they took; for to what happened on this Occasion *Ammianus Marcellinus* probably alludeth, where he writes, that *Constantius*, in exhibiting public Sports at *Rome*, was pleased with the Liberty they took to rally him, knowing it did not proceed from Pride or Ill-nature [h]. *Theodoret* telleth us, that to Acclamations so worthy of the *Roman*

[g] Theod. l. 2. c. 14. Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [h] Amm. l. 16.

man Piety the Emperor granted the Return of *Liberius* [i]; and with him agree *Sulpitius Severus* [k], and *Ruffinus* [l], But *Sozomen* [m], and all the Writers of thoſe Times, aſſure us, that his Return did not happen this, but the following Year 358, when he bought it dear by ſigning the condemnation of *Athanaſius*, and the Symbol or Creed, compoſed by the *Semi-Arians*, at *Sirmium*, now *Sirmiſh* in *Sclavonia*. *Conſtantius*, at the Requeſt of the *Roman* Ladies and People, promiſed to recall him, as I have related; but it was on Condition, ſaith *Sozomen* [n], that he ſhould agree with the Biſhops of the Court, that is, with the *Semi-Arians*. The Firmneſs which *Liberius* had hitherto ſhewn, left no room to doubt of his rejecting ſuch a Propoſal with the greateſt Indignation. But he now felt what before he had only beheld at a Diſtance: he began to compare the Eaſe and Plenty in which he had lived at *Rome*, with the Inconveniencies and Hardſhips of his preſent Exile. Beſides, from the Menaces thrown out againſt him by the Emperor's Officers, he apprehended his Life to be in Danger [o]. It is true, he had wiſhed for an Opportunity of ſhedding his Blood in ſo good a Cauſe, as I have related above. But who is not brave at a Diſtance from Danger? The Jealouſy he had of *Felix*, who, ſitting in his Chair, acted the High Pontiff at *Rome*, was the *Dalila*, ſaith *Baronius* [p], ſpeaking of his ſigning the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, who bereft this *Samſon* of all his Strength and Courage. However that be, it is certain, that the Strength and Courage, which he had with great Glory exerted on other Occaſions, vaniſhed at once. For he not only ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, but moreover approved, and received, as catholic, the Confeſſion or Symbol of *Sirmium* [q], Thus, to ingratiate himſelf

Liberius ſigns the Condemnation of Athanaſius, *and embraces the Doctrine of* Sirmium.

[i] Theod. ib. [k] Sulp. Sev. l. 2. p. 160. [l] Ruff. l. 1. c. 27.
[m] Soz. l. 4. c. 11. [n] Idem ibid. [o] Athan. ad Solit. p. 837.
[p] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 41. [q] Hil. frag. 1. p. 48. Hier vir. ill. 97.

himself with the Emperor and return to *Rome*, did *Liberius* abandon, at last, his persecuted Friend, renounce the Catholic Faith, and solemnly promise to maintain inviolable the Doctriue of *Sirmium*[e]. As he was impatient to be reinstated in his See, he took care immediately to acquaint the Emperor with the Steps he had taken. With this Letter he dispatched *Fortunatianus*, Bishop of *Aquileia*, charging him to solicit *Constantius* for his return, since he had done all he had required of him[f]. *Constantius* took no notice of, nor returned any Answer to this Letter. On the other hand, *Liberius* was heartily sick of his Exile, heartily sick of suffering for the sake of Justice. In Hopes therefore of puting a speedy End to his Exile, and the Hardships attending it, he wrote, in a most submissive and cringing Style, to the Eastern Bishops, assuring them, that it was merely out of Respect to his Predecessor *Julius*, and to maintain his Judgment, that he had undertaken the Defence of *Athanasius*; that as soon as it had pleased God to open his Eyes, and discover to him how justly he had been condemned, he had separated himself from his Communion, and joined them: that all their Decrees concerning him should be inviolably observed by the Apostolic See, as indeed they ought to be; that he sincerely and willingly received the true Catholic and Orthodox Faith, as it had been expounded and defined by several of his Brethren and Collegues at *Sirmium*, and had been proposed to him by his Collegue *Demophilus*; that he received every Article of that Symbol, and had nothing to object against any. This remarkable Letter he concludes thus: *And now that I agree with you in every Point, let me earnestly intreat your Holinesses to employ your joint Interest in my Behalf, that I may be recalled from Banishment, and suffered to return to the See, which God hath been pleased to commit to my Care*[t]. This Letter hath been

His Letter to the Eastern Bishops.

[e] Hil. frag. 1. p. 48. [f] Id. ib. p. 49. [t] Id. ib. p. 48, 48.

been conveyed to us by the great *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poitiers*, who in relating it, not able to reſtrain the juſt Indignation it kindled in his Breaſt, interrupteth the Recital Three times, to anathematize the Author of it, the *prevaricating Liberius*, as he ſtyleth him [u]. He wrote likewiſe to *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Germinius*, who bore great Sway at Court, and were at the Head of the *Arian* Faction in the Weſt, to acquaint them, that he communicated with them, and alſo with *Auxentius*, and *Epictetus*, Two of the moſt inveterate Enemies the Orthodox had; and that whoever did not communicate with them, that is, every Catholic Biſhop, was cut off from his Communion. Theſe Words *Hilarius* cannot repeat without anathematizing anew *Liberius*, and all the *Arians* with him. In the ſame Letter he lets them know, that he had ſeparated himſelf from the Communion of *Athanaſius*, *late Biſhop of* Alexandria, acknowleging him, by that Expreſſion, lawfully depoſed. He declareth, in the Beginning of his Letter, and calleth God to witneſs, that it is not by Compulſion, but merely for the ſake of Peace and Charity, far preferable to Martyrdom itſelf, that he writeth to them. He conjures them, by the omnipotent God, by his Son *Jeſus*, by the Holy Ghoſt, to intercede for him with the Emperor, that, by his Return, Peace and Tranquillity may be reſtored to the Church committed to his Care, aſſuring them, that the Zeal they exert in ſo pious, ſo juſt a Cauſe, will meet with a proportionable Reward in Heaven [w].

He is anathematized by Hilarius.

His Letter to the Biſhops at Court;

As the Emperor had not yet taken the leaſt notice of his Letter; as the Eaſtern Biſhops, as well as the Biſhops at Court, did not act, as he thought, with all the Zeal and Expedition he expected, and his ready Compliance well deſerved; he wrote a Third Letter, directed to *Vincentius*, Biſhop of *Capua*, acquainting him, that he had abandoned the Defence of

and to Vincentius, *Biſhop of* Capua.

[u] Hil. frag. 1. p. 47. 42. [w] Id. ib. p. 49.

of *Athanasius*, and desiring him to give notice thereof to all the Bishops of *Campania*; and at the same time to use his utmost Endeavours to persuade them to dispatch some of their Body with a Letter, in their common Name, to the Emperor, begging *Constantius* to deliver him, without further Delay, from his present most melancholy and deplorable Situation. To this Letter he adds the following Paragraph, in his own Hand: *We live in Peace with all the Bishops of the East, and with you. As for me, I have discharged my Conscience before God. Will you suffer me to perish in my present Exile? The same God will judge us both* [x]. The Bishop of *Capua* had been formerly sent, by *Liberius*, to the Council of *Arles*, with the Character of his Legate, as I have observed above, and had there signed the Condemnation of *Athanasius*; on which Occasion *Liberius* wished for an Opportunity of washing out, with his own Blood, the Stain which the Conduct of his Legate had brought upon his Character. But his only wish now was to see himself delivered from his painful Exile, and restored to his former State, upon any Terms. *Vincentius*, touched with his Complaints, prevailed upon the Bishops of *Campania*, to send a solemn Deputation to the Emperor in his Behalf; which *Constantius* complied with, so far as to recall him from the Place of his Exile to *Sirmium*, where the Court then was [y]. Upon his Arrival there, *Constantius*, who had lately embraced the Doctrine of the *Semi-Arians*, taking Advantage of his Weakness, and of the eager Desire he had betrayed of returning to his See, obliged him, as well as the Bishops of the Court, and Four *African* Bishops, who happened to be then at *Sirmium*, to sign the same Doctrine [z]. Thus did the infallible *Liberius* sign, and embrace, at least in Appearance, both the *Arian* and *Semi-Arian* Heresy; the *Arian* at *Beræa*, the Place of his Exile, and the *Semi-*

He is recalled from his Banishment to Sirmium.

He signs the Doctrine of the Semi-Arians.

[x] Idem ib. p. 51. [y] Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [z] Id. ib.

Semi-Arian at *Sirmium*. That the Confeſſion he ſigned at *Beræa* was *Arian*, cannot be doubted; for it was the Second of *Sirmium*, which all agree to have been *Arian* (C). Beſides, it was propoſed to him by *Demophilus*, Biſhop of *Beræa*, who was a moſt zealous Stickler for *Arianiſm*, and greatly attached to *Urſacius* and *Valens*, the Two leading Men among the *Arians* in the Weſt; and it is not at all probable, that he would have required *Liberius* to ſign a Doctrine different from that which he himſelf held.

The Advocates for the Pope's Infallibility are here quite at a Loſs what to ſay in Defence of that Prerogative. That *Liberius* ſigned the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, that he communicated with the *Arians*, and what above all galls them, that he received

(C) Three Councils were held at *Sirmium*, one in 349, another in 352, and the Third in 357. In the Firſt, *Photinus*, Biſhop of that City, was condemned, for reviving the Hereſy of *Paul* of *Samoſata*. This Council was intirely compoſed of the Weſtern Biſhops, who attempted to depoſe *Photinus*, but were vigorouſly oppoſed by the People. The Second Council of *Sirmium* was convened by the Emperor *Conſtantius*, and conſiſted of the Eaſtern Biſhops only, who condemned anew, and depoſed *Photinus*. By this Council a Symbol, or Creed, was compoſed, which hath been tranſmitted to us in *Greek* by St. *Athanaſius*, and in *Latin* by St. *Hilarius*; and is intirely Orthodox. In the Third Council of *Sirmium* a new Creed was compoſed by *Potamius*, Biſhop of *Liſbone*, and ſigned by *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and the other Biſhops then preſent. This Creed was altogether *Arian*; for not only the Word *Conſubſtantial* was rejected by it, but the Son was declared to be unlike the Father in Eſſence, to be leſs than the Father, and to have had a Beginning. And it was this Second Symbol of *Sirmium* that *Liberius* ſigned at *Beræa*. Upon his Arrival at *Sirmium* he found there *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, *Eleuſius* of *Cyzicus*, and the other *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, who were lately come from the Council of *Ancyra*, where they had condemned the Doctrine of the *Pure Arians*, and eſtabliſhed that of the *Semi-Arians*, holding the Son to be like the Father in Nature and Eſſence, but not *Conſubſtantial*, or of the ſame Subſtance. And this Doctrine *Liberius* ſigned out of Complaiſance to the Emperor, that nothing might obſtruct his Return to *Rome*. He ſigned it in a kind of Council, conſiſting of the *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, whom I have mentioned above.

ceived the *Sirmian* Confession of Faith as Catholic and Orthodox, are undeniable Matters of Fact. To reconcile them with Infallibility, is what they have been long drudging at: and to what pitiful Shifts, what eluding and unmeaning Distinctions, have they not been obliged to recur! like a Man struggling for Life in deep Water, and catching at every Twig to save it, they flounce from Quibble to Quibble, from one Subterfuge to another, but all in vain; sink they must, and their Infallibility with them. To shew their Distress, I shall briefly transcribe what I find offered on this Occasion, by the most learned among them, in Defence of the Cause they have undertaken. *Baronius*[b], after relating and owning the above-mentioned Facts, addresseth his Readers thus: *We have hitherto sailed among dangerous Rocks, among treacherous Sholes; but fear not, I shall at last pilot you safe into the Port of Truth.* Then, dropping his Allegory, he maketh a long Descant to prove, that the *Sirmian* Confession of Faith, signed by *Liberius*, was, in every Article, Catholic and Orthodox. A rare Pilot indeed! If this (to pursue his Allegory) is *the Port of Truth*, who can help pitying *Jerom*, *Hilarius*, *Athanasius*, and in short all the Antients? for they certainly missed it, and, falling in among those *dangerous Rocks*, *those treacherous Sholes*, which *Baronius* had the Skill and good Luck to avoid, were there unfortunately shipwrecked. For *Jerom* saith, in express Terms, and in Two Places[c], that *Liberius* signed an Heresy; *Hilarius*, that he approved of the *Arian* Perfidy[d]; *Athanasius*, that he joined the *Arians*[e]; and all the Antients, that he apostatized from the Faith: nay, *Liberius* himself, in his Letter to the Orientals, which is still to be seen under his own Hand, in the *Vatican* Library, gives them Notice, that *in all things* he agreeth

What alleged by Baronius in his Defence;

[b] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 46. [c] Hier. vir. ill. c. 97. & in chron.
[d] Hilar. frag. 2. p. 48. [e] Athan. ad Solit.

agreeth with *Demophilus*, a moſt zealous *Arian*, and with them; which Words *Hilarius* could not repeat without anathematizing him. It is therefore manifeſt, beyond all Diſpute, that the Confeſſion of Faith, ſigned by *Liberius*, was not Catholic, but *Arian*. Of this *Baronius* himſelf was, without Doubt, well apprized, and into this Port he had piloted his Reader, had Truth alone been his Land-mark. *Bellarmine*, the other great Stickler for Infallibility, purſueth a different Method, but with worſe Succeſs, in my Opinion, than his Fellow-Champion *Baronius*; for, by ſtriving to ſupport that chimerical Prerogative, he evidently overſetteth it. The Pope, according to him, may ſign and receive heretical Opinions, as *Liberius* did, without prejudicing in the leaſt his Infallibility, provided he doth not internally aſſent to them [f]; ſo that the ſo much boaſted Infallibility is by him reduced at laſt to this: that the Pope cannot internally aſſent to an Error; which is confining his Infallibility to himſelf, and conſequently diſqualifying him for the Office of a Teacher. Infallibility, even thus curtailed, is, no doubt, a moſt valuable Treaſure to the Owner, but of no more Uſe to the reſt of Mankind than a Treaſure concealed under Ground; and, on that very Account, it ought in common Senſe to be exploded. But it is ſcarce worth the while to quarrel with *Bellarmine* about it, ſince he cannot be ſo unreaſonable as to require us, in virtue of ſuch a Prerogative, to pay any Regard to the Deciſions of the Pope, till ſuch time, at leaſt, as we know them to be agreeable to his private Opinion; and this is what we can never know, ſince every Pope may, like *Liberius*, externally admit an Opinion as true; and, at the ſame time, internally reject it as falſe.

and by Bellarmine.

But, to return to *Liberius*; he was at laſt, in regard of his ready Compliance with the Will of the Empe-

Liberius returneth to Rome.

[f] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 9.

Emperor, allowed to return to *Rome*; but on Condition, that he ſhould govern jointly with *Felix* [g]. Letters were accordingly diſpatched both to *Felix*, and the *Roman* Clergy, to acquaint them therewith. *Sozomen* ſeemeth to inſinuate, that they both governed thus for ſome time [h]. But, according to St. *Jerom*, and the Two Preſbyters *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, who lived then at *Rome*, and were Eye-witneſſes of what they relate, *Felix* was driven not only from the See, but out of the City, as ſoon as *Liberius* entered it; which he did on the 2d of *Auguſt* 358, in a kind of Triumph, being met and received by the whole People, with loud Acclamations of Joy [i]. *Felix* returned ſoon after, at the Inſtigation of a few of the Eccleſiaſtics, who had, contrary to their Oath adhered to him; and even attempted to perform Divine Service in the Baſilic of *Julius*, beyond the *Tyber*; but the enraged Multitude drove him out a Second time, and, with him, all the Eccleſiaſtics, who had acknowleged him [k]. *Socrates* writes, that the Emperor himſelf was in the End obliged to give him up, and conſent to his Expulſion [l]. Mention is made in the Pontificals of a bloody Perſecution, raiſed in *Rome* by *Liberius*, and his Party, againſt the Partiſans of *Felix*, who, it is ſaid, were inhumanly murdered in the Streets, in the Baths, in all public Places, and even in the Churches [m]. But as none of the Antients take the leaſt Notice of ſuch Cruelties, I will not charge *Liberius* with them, upon the bare Authority of ſuch Records. *Felix*, being driven from *Rome*, withdrew to a ſmall Eſtate he had on the Road to *Porto*, and there ſpent the remaining Part of his Life in Retirement [n]. *Sozomen* ſuppoſeth him to have died ſoon after [o]. But the Two Preſbyters

Felix is driven out.

[g] Soz. l. 4. c. 15. [h] Id. ib. [i] Hier. chron. Mar. & Fauſt. p. 4. [k] Idem ib. [l] Socr. l. 2. c. 37. [m] Anaſt. c. 37. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 31. [n] Theod. l. 2. c. 13. Philg. l. 4. c. 3. [o] Soz. l. 4. c. 15.

ters *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, who must have been better informed, assure us, that he lived Seven Years after the Return of *Liberius*, and died on the 22d of *November* 365[p].

Concerning *Felix*, all the Antients agree, that he was unlawfully elected and ordained; that he communicated with the *Arians*; that, to ingratiate himself with them, and the Emperor, he signed the Condemnation of *Athanasius*; that he was guilty of Perjury in accepting the Episcopal Dignity, having bound himself, with the rest of the Clergy, by a solemn Oath, to acknowlege no other Bishop while *Liberius* lived; and, lastly, that he strove to keep Possession of the *Roman* See, after the Return of the lawful Bishop, and to sit in it, together with him, in open Defiance of the Canons of the Church. *Socrates* adds, that he not only communicated with the *Arians*, but was infected with the *Arian* Heresy[q]. *Athanasius* styleth him *a Monster, raised to the See of* Rome *by the Malice of Antichrist, one worthy of those who raised him, and in every respect well qualified for the Execution of their wicked Designs*[r]. And yet this Heretic, this Monster, this Intruder, or Antipope, is honoured (the Reader will be surprized to hear it) is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint; nay, as a Martyr; and his Festival is kept to this Day, on the 29th of *July*. This Honour was conferred on him in the Ages of Darkness and Ignorance, upon the Authority of his fabulous Acts, and a more fabulous Pontifical, from which his Acts seem to have been copied. In the Pontifical it is said, that *Felix* declared *Constantius*, who had been twice baptized, an Heretic; and was therefore, by an Order from the incensed Emperor, apprehended, and privately beheaded, with many Ecclesiastics and Laymen, under the Walls of *Rome*, on the 11th of *November*. It is added,

The Judgment of the Antients concerning Felix.

He is honoured by the Church of Rome *as a Saint and a Martyr.*

[p] Marc. & Faust. p. 4. [q] Socrat. l. 2. c 37. [r] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861.

added, That the Presbyter *Damasus* privately conveyed his Body to a Church, which *Felix* had built, and there interred it: and that, upon his Death, the See remained vacant for the Space of Thirty-eight Days[r]. In the Acts of *Felix* we read, that *Constantius* was rebaptized by *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Nicomedia*; that *Felix* having, on that Account, declared him an Heretic, he was driven from the See of *Rome*, and *Liberius* replaced on it; that *Felix* thereupon retired into the Country, but was brought back by the Emperor's Orders, and beheaded on the 10th of *November*; that his Body was interred on the 20th of the same Month, in a Church, which he had built while he was a Presbyter: And we keep his Festival, adds the Author, on the 29th of *July*[t]. *Anastasius* hath copied the Pontifical Word for Word, except that he pretendeth *Felix* to have been beheaded at *Cora*, in the *Campagna* of *Rome*[u]; though he hath told us, in the foregoing Page, that he *died in Peace*, a Phrase never used in speaking of Martyrs, on the 29th of *July*, at his Estate on the Road to *Porto*[w]. The City of *Cere*, now *Cervetera*, in *Tuscany*, honoureth *Felix* to this Day, as their chief Patron or Protector. In those dark Times Legends alone were in request, and all other Books, even the Scripture itself, quite out of Date, and neglected. No Wonder therefore that such Absurdities, however inconsistent with History, were swallowed without straining; and *Felix*, for his pretended Zeal and Constancy, ranked among the holy Martyrs. For I may venture to affirm, that the most learned Men at that Time, in the Church, knew nothing of *Felix* but what they had learned from his fabulous Acts, and from the above-mentioned Pontifical. That I may not be thought to exaggerate, I shall allege one Instance of the Ignorance of past Times: *Gulielmus a Sancto*

His fabulous Acts.

How he came to be honoured as a Saint.

[r] Vide Bolland. Apr. t. 1. p. 31. [t] MS. p. 219. [u] Anast. c. 37. p. 22. [w] Idem ib. p. 21.

Sancto Amore, one of the moſt learned Men of the 13th Century, knew, that, in the Time of *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poitiers*, a Pope, with moſt of the Biſhops, had fallen into Hereſy. He did not even pretend to be ſo well verſed in Hiſtory as to know for certain who the Pope was; but, indulging a Conjecture, which he thought probable enough, he named *Anaſtaſius* II. who died in 498, about 150 Years after the Time of *Hilarius*: ſo that he was an utter Stranger to the Hiſtory of Pope *Liberius*, and conſequently to that of the Antipope *Felix*. Had it not been for the like Ignorance in more early Times, the Apotheoſis of our pretended Martyr had never taken Place. Be that as it will, during the Ages of Darkneſs he held undiſturbed the Rank, to which he had been thus raiſed: but when the Dawn of Knowlege began to appear, and it was diſcovered at laſt from cotemporary and unexceptionable Writers, who *Felix* was, the Church of *Rome* was aſhamed to own him among her Saints. On the other hand, to degrade him had been giving a fatal Blow to the Pope's Authority, and rendering it for ever precarious, in ſo material a Point as that of Canonization. *Felix* therefore was, at all Events, to keep his Place in Heaven; his Sanctity was to be confirmed, and the World impoſed upon by ſome Contrivance or other, capable of utterly defeating the Teſtimony of the Antients.

His Sanctity called in queſtion;

This Point being ſettled, to prevent all Suſpicion of Deceit, or underhand Dealings, Pope *Gregory* XIII. declared, in 1582, his Intention of having the Cauſe of *Felix* impartially examined. In order to this, he appointed *Baronius*, employed at that Time in reforming the *Roman* Martyrology, to put in Writing whatever could be objected againſt *Felix*, and Cardinal *Santorio* to anſwer his Objections, and collect likewiſe in Writing all that could be ſaid in favour of his new Client, that the Pope might be thoroughly acquainted with the Merits of the Cauſe before he

and his Cauſe re examined.

came to a final Decision. This Conduct in *Gregory* hath been censured by some over-zealous Divines of the Church of *Rome*, as if he had thereby given the World Occasion to think that he questioned the Infallibility of his Predecessors, who had honoured *Felix* as a Saint[x]. But *Gregory* well knew what he was doing, and how the Whole would end. In Compliance with his Orders *Baronius* wrote a Dissertation, which he himself called a Volume, and not a short one[y], to prove that *Felix* was neither a Saint nor a Martyr. As he had Truth on his Side, Cardinal *Santorio*, though a Man of Learning, could neither answer his Arguments, nor offer any thing in so desperate a Cause worthy of himself. He often addressed himself in his Prayers to his Client, entreating him to undertake his own Cause, by suggesting to him what might be alleged in his Defence. But the Client was no less at a Stand than the Advocate: Some other Person therefore must interpose: And whom did the carrying or losing of such a Cause more nearly concern than the Pope, since his Authority in a most essential Point was at Stake? This was a nice Affair, and to be managed with great Art and Dexterity. *Gregory*, therefore, having often heard both Sides, in a full Congregation of Cardinals, without betraying the least Partiality for *Felix*, appointed them to meet for the last time on the 28th of *July*, the Eve of the pretended Saint's Festival, judging that the most proper Time to play off with good Success the Trick, which he had kept the whole Time *in petto*. The Cardinals met on the Day appointed; *Baronius* quite silenced his Adversary; the whole Assembly was fully convinced, that *Felix* was no Saint, no Martyr; the Pope himself seemed to fall in with the rest, and accordingly rose up to declare, as was thought, the unhappy *Felix* fallen from Heaven;

[x] Leuchesini de infall. sed. Rom. p. 97. Rossi vicario di Cristo p. 72. [y] Baron. ad ann. 557. n. 63.

Heaven; when a great Noiſe was all on a ſudden heard at the Door, and immediately a Meſſenger entered, who, after uttering theſe Words, *Holy* Felix, *pray for us*, acquainted the Pope and the Cardinals, that the Body of *Felix* was juſt diſcovered. Hereupon they all repaired in great haſte to the Church of *Coſmas* and *Damianus*, where the miraculous Diſcovery had been made; and there ſaw, in a Marble Coffin of an extraordinary Size, on one Side the Bodies of *Mark*, *Marcellianus*, and *Tranquillinus*; and on the other that of *Felix*, with this Inſcription on a Stone that lay by it, *The Body of St.* Felix, *who condemned* Conſtantius [z]. Hereupon the *Te Deum* was ſung with great Solemnity for the Triumph of Truth: *Felix* was declared worthy of the Veneration and Worſhip that had till then been paid him, and a Place was allowed him among the other Saints in the *Roman* Martyrology, where it is ſaid, that *he was driven from his See for defending the Catholic Faith, by* Conſtantius *an* Arian *Emperor, and privately put to Death at* Cere, *now* Cervetera, *in* Tuſcany. *Baronius*, tranſported with Joy, as he himſelf declareth [a], at ſo miraculous and ſeaſonable a Diſcovery, immediately yielded, not to his Antagoniſt *Santorio*, but to *Felix*, who had evidently interpoſed; and, taking that Interpoſition for a ſatisfactory Anſwer to all his Arguments, he immediately retracted whatever he had ſaid, and conſigned to the Flames whatever he had written in Oppoſition to *Felix* [b]. Thus, to maintain a chimerical Prerogative, they ſport with Truth; betray into Error thoſe who confide in them; and, turning the worſt of Men into Saints, honour Vice with the greateſt Reward they can beſtow on Virtue.

His Sanctity and Martyrdom confirmed by the Diſcovery of his Body.

That the pretended Diſcovery was nothing but a Contrivance to confirm the Martyrdom of *Felix*, and impoſe upon the World, is manifeſt; and that the Ponti-

His Legend proved to be fabulous.

[z] Baron. ad ann. 557. n. 63. [a] Id. ib. n 64. [b] Id ib.

Pontifical, and his Acts, on which his Martyrdom was originally founded, were a no less palpable and gross Imposition, may be easily demonstrated. For, in the first place, *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, who lived in the Time of *Felix* and *Liberius* at *Rome*, tell us, in express Terms, that *Felix*, *who had been substituted to* Liberius, *died on the* 22*d of* November 365[c], that is, Four Years after the Death of *Constantius*, by whom he is said, in his Acts, and in the Pontifical, to have been martyred. *Athanasius* assureth us[d], and with him agree *Philostorgius*[e], and the Chronicle of *Alexandria*[f], that *Constantius* was not baptized till at the Point of Death, when he received that Sacrament at the Hands of *Euzoius*, the *Arian* Bishop of *Antioch*. And yet both the Acts of *Felix*, and the Pontifical, will have him to have been twice baptized before his Death; for it was on this Account that *Felix* is said to have declared him an Heretic. This Declaration *Baronius* improved into a solemn Excommunication; and, being become, after the above-mentioned Discovery, a most zealous Advocate for *Felix*, telleth us, that the holy Martyr was no sooner placed on the Throne of St. *Peter*, than, changing his Conduct, he separated himself from the Communion of those by whom he had been raised, and boldly thundered an Anathema against the Emperor himself[g].

He did not excommunicate Constantius.

What a Pity that *Athanasius* was not better acquainted with the Conduct of *Felix!* for if he had, he would never have styled him *a Monster placed on the See of* Rome *by the Malice of Antichrist*. Such an Attempt, unheard of till that Time, must have made a great Noise; and yet I find it was heard by none but *Baronius*, who lived at so great a Distance. I may add, that there was no room for an Excommunication against *Constantius*, who was still a Catechumen, and

[c] Marcell. & Faust. p. 4. [d] Athan. de syn. p. 907. [e] Philost. l. 6. c. 6. [f] Chron. Alex. p. 684. [g] Bar. ad ann. 357. num. 65.

and conſequently did not partake of the ſacred Myſteries.

The *Roman* Catholic Writers, to ſave the Credit of *Felix*, maintain him to have been, at leaſt for ſome time, lawful Pope. But, to confute whatever hath been or can be ſaid by them in his Favour, without entering into a Detail of the many ſophiſtical and unconcluſive Arguments, falſe Aſſertions, and groundleſs Suppoſitions, with which they endeavour to diſguiſe the Truth, and confound their Readers, I argue thus: That *Liberius* was lawfully choſen, and *Felix* unlawfully, is paſt all Diſpute. Now, upon the Fall of *Liberius*, either there was, or there was not, a new Election: if there was not, *Liberius* continued to be lawful Biſhop; or if by his Fall he forfeited his Dignity, as ſome think he did, the See became vacant; for nothing ſubſequent to the unlawful Election of *Felix* could render it lawful. If there was a new Election, and *Felix* was lawfully choſen, *Liberius* from that Minute either ceaſed to be Pope, or there were Two lawful Popes at a time. The latter they will not admit, leſt they ſhould turn the Church into a Monſter with Two Heads. They muſt therefore allow *Felix* to have been lawful Pope, and *Liberius* an Antipope, till the See became vacant by the Death of the former. But, on the other hand, this new Election is quite groundleſs, highly improbable, and abſolutely repugnant to what we read in the antient and cotemporary Writers. It is quite groundleſs; for though *Bellarmine* ſpeaketh of a new Election with as much Confidence as if he had been one of the Electors[h]; yet we find not the leaſt Hint of it in any of the Writers of thoſe Times, who would not have paſſed over in Silence ſo remarkable an Event, had it come to their Knowlege. It is highly improbable; for *Liberius* was greatly beloved by the whole People, and the far greater Part of the Clergy, and

Whether a lawful Pope or an Antipope.

Felix an Antipope.

Felix

[h] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 9.

Felix hated to such a Degree, that of all the Inhabitants of *Rome*, not one ever appeared in the Church while he was in it[i]; nay, he was by all avoided, even in the Streets and other public Place, as if he had carried about with him a Contagion[k]. Is it not therefore altogether improbable, that the People and Clergy should depose the Man, whom in a manner they adored, for communicating with the *Arians*, and appoint one in his room, who likewise communicated with them, and was universally detested, avoided, and abhorred? And yet all this is gravely supposed by *Bellarmine*[l]. Lastly, the Election of *Felix* is repugnant to what we read in the antient Writers, who all speak of him as an Antipope, and an Intruder. *Optatus*, who lived at that very Time, and St. *Austin*, who flourished soon after, have not allowed him a Place in their Catalogues of the Bishops of *Rome*. *Theodoret* taketh no notice of him in his Catalogue of the Bishops of the chief Cities. St. *Jerom* and *Prosper* count *Liberius* the Thirty-fourth Bishop of *Rome*, and *Damasus*, who succeeded him, the Thirty fifth; a plain Indication that they did not look upon *Felix* as lawful Bishop. Among the Moderns, *Onuphrius Panvinius*, in his Lives of the Popes, printed in 1557, some Years before the Discovery of *Felix*'s Body, called *Novatian* the First Antipope, and *Felix* the Second. But his Book was prohibited in 1583, the Year after the Second Canonization of *Felix*. The Writers, who came after, took Warning; and such of them as thought it base to concur in deceiving Mankind, since it was not safe to undeceive them, chose to wave this Subject, but not without giving some broad Hints of what they believed in their Hearts. Thus *F. Labb*[m], and Cardinal *Bona*[n], take no notice of this *Felix*, but call Pope *Felix*, who was raised to the See of *Rome* in 485,

[i] Theodor. p. 610. [k] Athan. ad Solit. p. 861. [l] Bell. ib.
[m] Lab. chron. [n] Bona, lit. l. 2, c. 11. p. 423.

485, the Second Pope of that Name. *Felix* I. was martyred under *Aurelian* in 274, as we have related elſewhere [o]. *F. Labbé*, at the Death of *Felix* II. which happened in 492, adds, that he was the Third of that Name, according to *Baronius* [p]. Had *Felix* never been canonized, no Man would have been ſo regardleſs of his own Reputation as to undertake his Defence; but *Gregory* having declared him a Saint, and, by ſuch a Declaration, linked his Cauſe with Infallibility in a moſt eſſential Point, the hired Champions of that See found themſelves under an indiſpenſable Obligation of entering the Liſts; which I need not ſay they have done to no Purpoſe.

Acknowleged as ſuch by ſome Roman *Catholic Writers.*

The Fall of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who was at the Head of the orthodox Party, inſpired the Emperor with great Hopes of ſucceeding in the Deſign he had formed of utterly aboliſhing the orthodox Faith; he found there were but few Biſhops whoſe Virtue was Proof againſt the Frowns and Reſentment of the Court. In the Council held at *Arles* in 353, they had all to a Man choſen rather to communicate with the *Arians*, than be driven from their Sees: in that which was convened Two Years after, at *Milan*, only Three Biſhops were found, *viz.* *Dionyſius* Biſhop of that City, *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, and *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, who, equally unmoved by Threats and Promiſes, had maintained the Truth with the Loſs of their Dignity. The Example of the Biſhop of *Rome* had been followed by the far greater Part of the Biſhops of *Italy*. But what above all encouraged the Emperor to purſue the Scheme he had ſo much at heart, was the Fall of the celebrated *Oſius* Biſhop of *Cordoua*, in the Hundredth Year of his Age, and Sixty-ſecond of his Epiſcopacy. As the Name of *Oſius* is one of the moſt famous in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of thoſe Times, and his Fall is alleged by the Antints as a memorable Inſtance of the Weakneſs of Human

The Emperor undertakes the eſtabliſhing of Arianiſm.

[o] Vide p. 104. [p] Lab. ibid.

Human Nature, however strengthened and improved by a long Practice of the most eminent Virtues, a succinct Account of so remarkable an Event will not, I hope, be unacceptable to the Reader, or thought foreign to the Subject in hand.

A succinct Account of the Life of Osius *Bishop of* Cordoua.

Osius was a Native of *Spain* [p], born, according to some, in *Cordoua*, about the Year 256, and raised, in regard of his extraordinary Merit, to the See of that City in 295 [q]. He was even then conspicuous for the Firmness of his Faith, and the Purity of his Life, saith *Sozomen* [r]. *Athanasius*, who was well acquainted with him, speaketh of him with the greatest Respect and Esteem, calling him a Man truly holy, according to the *Greek* Signification of his Name; one in whose Conduct even his most inveterate Enemies could discover nothing that was not commendable, his Life being irreprehensible, and his Reputation unspotted [s]. *Theodoret* [t], and *Eusebius* [u], extol him on Account of his extraordinary Prudence, Wisdom, and Learning, which gave great Weight to his Opinion in the many Councils at which he assisted, and often presided. In the Year 300, he was present at the Council of *Eliberis*, or *Illeberis*, in *Spain*, famous for the Severity of its Canons, and, in all Likelihood, made even then a considerable Figure; since, in the Acts of that Council, he is named in the Second Place after *Felix* of *Acci*, now *Guadix*, in *Andalusia*, who probably presided [w]. Three Years after broke out the Persecution of *Maximian Hercules*, in which *Osius* distinguished himself by his Zeal, his Constancy, and his Sufferings; for, having with great Intrepidity confessed his Faith before the Pagan Magistrates, he was by them imprisoned, and kept under a very close and painful Confinement for the Space of Two Years, that is, from the Year 303, to 305, when, upon the Abdication

He is imprisoned under Maximian *for the Confession of the Faith.*

[p] Athan. ad Sol. p. 838. [q] Soz. l. 1. c. 16. [r] Id. ib.
[s] Athan. ad Sol. p. 841. [t] Theod. l. 1. c. 6. [u] Euseb. vit. Const l. 2. c. 63. [w] Concil. tom. 1. p. 969.

cation of *Maximian* and *Diocleſian*, he was ſet at Liberty by *Conſtantius Chlorus*, the Father of *Conſtantine the Great* [x]. He is honoured by *Athanaſius* [y], by the Council of *Sardica*, and by moſt of the Antients, with the Title of *Confeſſor*, which was given to ſuch as had ſuffered Impriſonment, Torments, or Exile, but had not died for the Confeſſion of the Faith. He was highly eſteemed and revered by *Conſtantine*, not only as a Confeſſor, but as a Perſon of extraordinary Wiſdom and Probity [z]; whence he is thought to have been one of the Prelates whom that Prince conſulted in 311 [a], and kept with him to inſtruct him in the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion. Some think that *Oſius* was meant by the *Egyptian* Prieſt come from *Spain*, to whom *Zoſimus* aſcribes the Change made by *Conſtantine* in point of Religion [b]. The Church of *Cordoua* was, out of Regard to him, inriched by *Conſtantine* with many valuable Preſents, whence he is ſaid to have been very rich [c]. But what Uſe he made of his Wealth we may learn from *Athanaſius*, who aſſureth us, that no one in Want ever applied to him without being relieved, and receiving the Supply he demanded [d]. In the famous Diſpute, which I have taken notice of in its proper Place, between *Cæcilianus* and the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, *Oſius* undertook, with great Zeal, the Defence of the former, and prevailed in the End upon *Conſtantine* to eſpouſe his Cauſe, and declare againſt the *Donatiſts* [e], whom he thenceforth puniſhed with great Severity, taking their Churches from them, and ſending the moſt obſtinate among them into Exile. *Conſtantine* being become Maſter of the Eaſt in the Year 323, his firſt Care was to put an End to the unhappy Diviſions that reigned in thoſe Churches about the Celebration of *Eaſter*, and ſome other controverted

He inſtructeth Conſtantine.

[x] Ath. ad Sol. p. 838 Euſeb. vit. Conſt. l. 2. c. 63. [y] Ath. ib. apol. 2. p. 760. & alibi. [z] Euſeb. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 7. [a] Euſeb. ib. l. 1. c. 7. [b] Zoſ. l. 2. p. 435. [c] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 34. [d] Ath. de fug. p, 704. [e] Aug. in Parm. l. 1. c. 8.

He is sent by him to compose some Disputes there.

troverted Points. With this View he dispatched *Osius* into the East, who, upon his Arrival there, summoned a Council to meet at *Alexandria*, which, under his Influence, condemned the Heresy of *Sabellius*, put a Stop to the Schism of one *Colluthus*, and greatly allayed the Animosity of the contending Parties about the Day on which *Easter* was to be kept [f]. On his Return to Court, the Account he gave of the *Arians*, whose Heresy he had endeavoured in vain to suppress, made so deep an Impression in the Mind of the Emperor, that, for a long time, he continued highly prejudiced against them [g]. It was at the Suggestion of *Osius*, that *Constantine* assembled the Council of *Nice* in 325, at which he assisted, and distinguished himself above the rest [h]; for of all Councils he was the Head and Leader, as *Athanasius* styleth him [i]. By him was worded and drawn up the famous *Nicene* Symbol or Creed, as we are told in express Terms by *Athanasius* [k]. He presided at the Council of *Sardica*, which, at his Request, was assembled by the Emperor *Constans* in 347 [l]. From that Council he retired to his Bishoprick, and continued there undisturbed until the Year 355, when *Constantius* seeing himself Master of the West, as well as of the East, undertook to oblige all the Bishops to condemn *Athanasius*, whose Cause was looked upon as inseparable from that of the orthodox Faith. As *Osius* had on all Occasions declared highly in his Favour, and the Example of a Prelate so venerable for his Age, for the glorious Title of Confessor, and the Figure he had made for many Years in the Church, greatly prejudiced the World against the Enemies of the persecuted Bishop, the Emperor resolved to deprive, if possible, the Orthodox Party, of so powerful a Support. With this View he ordered *Osius* to repair to *Milan*, where the Court then was, well knowing

He assisteth at the Council of Nice, *and draws up the* Nicene *Creed.*

Constantius *attempts in vain to gain him over to the* Arian *Party.*

[f] Euseb. vit. Const. l. 2. c. 73. [g] Socr. l. 1. c. 8. [h] Sulp. l. 2. c. 55. Theod. l. 2. c. 12. [i] Athan. fug. p. 703. [k] Athan. ad Sol. p. 837. [l] Hil. frag. 2. p. 16.

knowing that he was not, like moſt other Biſhops, to be terrified with threatening Letters. *Oſius*, in Compliance with the Emperor's Orders, ſet out without Delay from *Cordoua*, notwithſtanding his great Age; and arriving at *Milan*, was there received by the Emperor with all the Reſpect that was due to the *Father of Biſhops*, as he was ſtyled. *Conſtantius* entertained him for ſome Days with the utmoſt Civility, hoping by that means to bring him into his Views; but he no ſooner named *Athanaſius* to him, than the zealous Prelate, well knowing the Drift of his Diſcourſe, and armed againſt all Temptations, interrupted him with declaring, that he was ready to ſacrifice not One, but a Thouſand Lives in ſo juſt a Cauſe; nay, he even reprimanded the Emperor with great Freedom, who, out of an awful Reverence for a Prelate of his Years, Authority, and Figure, heard him with great Patience, and not only forbore offering him any Violence, but gave him leave to return unmoleſted to his See[m].

His ſecond Attempt to gain him.

The mild Treatment *Oſius* met with gave great Uneaſineſs to the *Arian* Party, eſpecially to the Two Biſhops, *Urſacius* and *Valens*, who thereupon never ceaſed ſoliciting the Emperor to proceed with Vigour againſt the only Man, who, they ſaid, was capable of obſtructing his great and pious Deſigns. They were powerfully ſeconded by the Eunuchs, who prevailed in the End upon the Emperor, as they bore a great Sway at Court, to try anew the Firmneſs and Conſtancy of ſo celebrated a Champion. *Conſtantius* therefore wrote ſeveral Letters to him, treating him in ſome with great Reſpect, and ſtyling him his Father, but menacing him in others, and naming to him the Biſhops, whom he had baniſhed for refuſing to condemn a Man, whom moſt Biſhops, and ſeveral Councils, had already condemned[n]. *Oſius*, inflexible and unmoved, anſwered the Emperor

[m] Ath. ad Sol. p. 837—841. [n] Id. ib. p. 838.

His Letter to the Emperor.

ror by a Letter worthy of himself, and the great Reputation he had acquired. It hath been conveyed to us by *Athanasius*, and nothing can be said stronger in that Bishop's Defence; for he there sheweth unanswerably, that, whatever Crimes might be alledged against him, his only Guilt was a steady Adherence to the Faith of *Nice* [o]. But *Constantius*, without hearkening to the Reasons he urged in Justification of his own and *Athanasius*'s Conduct, without paying the least Regard to the earnest Prayers and Intreaties, to the paternal Exhortations and Admonitions, of so venerable a Prelate, ordered him to quit his See forthwith, and repair to *Sirmium*, where he was kept a whole Year in a kind of Exile. But, unaffected with the many Hardships he suffered there, with the Loss of his Dignity, with the inhuman Treatment of his Relations, who were all persecuted, stripped of their Estates, and reduced to Beggary on his Account, *Osius* still stood up in Defence of *Athanasius*, still rejected with Indignation the Proposals of his Enemies [p], striving to induce him at least to communicate with them. They therefore resolved to proceed to open Force, and either to gain over to their Party a Man of his Figure and Rank, or, by removing him out of the Way, to deprive the Orthodox of their main Support [q]. Accordingly, with the Emperor's Consent and Approbation, they caused him first to be closely confined, and afterwards to be cruelly beaten; and lastly, to be put to the Rack, and most inhumanly tortured, as if he had been the worst of Criminals [r]. Even against such exquisite Torments the Firmness of his Mind was Proof for some Time; but the Weakness of his Body obliged him in a manner to yield at last, and communicate with *Ursacius* and *Valens* [s]. *Athanasius* seemeth to insinuate

He is sent to Sirmium.

Confined and racked.

He yields at last.

[o] Id. ib. p. 838—840. [p] Athan. ib. p. 841. Sulp. l. 2. p. 162. Socr. l. 2. c. 31. [q] Ath. de fug. p. 704. Apol. 2. p. 807. [r] Id ib. Socr. p. 127. [s] Ath. ad Sol. p. 841.

ſinuate in ſome Places, that he ſigned his Condemnation[t]; but in another he expreſly denieth it[u]. *Sulpitius Severus* thinketh he was guilty of no other Crime but that of communicating with the *Arians*[w]. *Athanaſius* only ſays, that he conſented to communicate with *Urſacius* and *Valens*[x]. However, that he did not ſtop there, but ſigned the *Arian* Confeſſion of *Sirmium*, is but too manifeſt from ſeveral unexceptionable and cotemporary Writers. *Phœbadius* Biſhop of *Agen*, in *France*, in his Anſwer written as this very Time to the *Arians*, bragging, that their Doctrine had been approved and embraced by the great *Oſius*, allows the Fact; but adds, that he was induced thereunto by Force, and not Conviction[y]. *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, who wrote at the ſame time, ſay, that *Oſius* ſet his Hand, but never yielded his Heart, to the *Arian* Impiety[z]. Nay, *Hilarius* Biſhop of *Poitiers* ſuppoſes the *Sirmian* Confeſſion of Faith to have been drawn up by *Oſius* and *Potamus*; for he often calleth it, *the Hereſy, the Blaſphemies, the wild and mad Conceits of* Oſius *and* Potamus[a]. *Vigilius Tapſenſis* ranketh *Oſius* with *Urſacius, and the other wicked Men, who compoſed the ſacrilegious Confeſſion of* Sirmium[b]. *Socrates* writes, that he ſigned the *Sirmian* Symbol[c]; *Sozomen*, that he conſented to the Suppreſſion of the Words *Omooufion*, and *Omoiouſion*[d]; and *Euſebius* of *Vercelli* beſtoweth high Encomiums on *Gregory* Biſhop of *Elvira*, for oppoſing the great *Tranſgreſſor* Oſius[e]. *Potamus*, whom I have mentioned above, was Biſhop of *Liſbone*, and a moſt ſanguine Stickler for the Orthodox Party; but upon the Emperor's yielding to him ſome Lands of the Imperial Demeſne, that lay very convenient for

He ſigns the Sirmian *Confeſſion of Faith.*

[t] Ath. de fug. p. 704, & apol. 2. p. 807. [u] Id. ad Sol. p. 841. [w] Sulp. l. 2. p. 161, 162. [x] Ath. ad Sol. p. 841. [y] Phœbad. contr. Arian. p. 180. [z] Mar. & Fauſt. p. 34. [a] Hil. de ſyn. p. 124, 125, 133. [b] Vigil. in Eutychian. l. 5. n. 3. [c] Socr. l. 2. c. 31. [d] Soz. l. 4. c. 12. [e] Hil. frag. 2. p. 4.

for him, he changed Sides, and became a most zealous Champion of the *Arian* Doctrine[f]; insomuch that he is ranked by *Phœbadius* with *Ursacius* and *Valens*, the Two great Apostles of the *Arians*[g].

The Arians triumph.

The Fall of the great *Osius*, whom the orthodox Party looked upon as their invincible Hero, surprised the whole World[h]. Some could not believe it; others ascribed it to his great Age, which might have weakened his Judgment[i]. It was immediately published all over the East, and great Rejoicings were made on the Occasion, by the Bishops in those Parts, who looked upon such a Conquest as a signal Victory over the Orthodox[k]. *Phœbadius* telleth us, that the chief Argument alledged by the *Arians*, in favour of their Doctrine, against the Bishops of *Gaul*, was *the Conversion of* Osius, as they styled it[l]. Here *Davidius* pleaseth himself with ridiculing, and indeed very justly, this and several other Conversions, greatly boasted by the *Arians*; but he must give me Leave to put him in mind, that he ridiculeth, at the same time, the many Conversions which his Church is constantly boasting, since most of them, especially those thus made in the new World, have been owing to Arguments of the same nature as that of *Osius*, and other *Arian* Proselytes, and were not perhaps at all more sincere. *Hilarius*, Bishop of *Poitiers*, who lived at this time in exile, amidst the *Arians* in *Phrygia*, seemeth not to be well informed as to the Circumstances of the Fall of *Osius*, else he had made some Allowance for the barbarous and inhuman Treatment the unhappy Prelate met with, and not reflected on him with so much Bitterness and Severity, saying, that it had pleased God to prolong his Life until he fell, that the World might know what he had been before he fell[m]. That a Man in the Hundreth

Hilarius not well informed as to the Circumstances of his Fall.

[f] Marcell. & Faust. p. 34. [g] Phœbad. p. 169. [h] Id. p. 180. Soz. l. 4. c. 12. [i] Sulp. l. 2. p. 161, 162. [k] Soz ib. [l] Phœbad. p. 180. [m] Hil. syn. p. 133.

dreth Year of his Age ſhould yield to moſt exquiſite and repeated Torments, is not at all to be wondered at; and therefore had *Hilarius* been better informed, he had rather pitied than reproached him. But the *Arians*, among whom he lived, took care to conceal whatever could any ways depreciate their boaſted Victory: at leaſt that *Hilarius* was a Stranger to what *Oſius* had ſuffered, is manifeſt, from his aſcribing the Fall of that great Prelate not to the Cruelty of his Enemies, but to the too great Love he had for his Sepulchre [n], meaning, I ſuppoſe, the Deſire he had of dying in his native Country, and not in Exile.

Oſius having thus gratified the Emperor, by communicating with the *Arians*, and ſigning the *Sirmian* Confeſſion of Faith, he was immediately reinſtated in his See, and ſuffered to return to his native Country, where he gave ſome Trouble, it ſeemeth, to the Orthodox Biſhops; for *Gregory*, Biſhop of *Elvira*, is highly commended by *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, who lived then in Exile, *for oppoſing the Tranſgreſſor* Oſius, as I have obſerved above. The unfortunate Prelate did not live long after his Fall, but died in the Latter-end of the ſame Year 357, according to the moſt probable Opinion. He did not forget the Crime he had committed, ſaith *Athanaſius* [o], but grievouſly complained at the Point of Death, of the Violence that had been offered him, anathematized the Hereſy of *Arius*, and exhorted, as by his laſt Will, all Mankind to reject it [p]. To his Repentance *Athanaſius*, no doubt, alludeth, where he writes, that *Oſius* yielded only for a time [q]; which he ſaith of no other, not even of *Liberius*. As for the Account, which ſome Writers give of his tragical End [r], it is not worthy of Notice. The *Greek* Church honoureth him as a Saint, and his Feſtival is kept on the 27th of

He is reſtored to his See.

[n] Idem ib. p. 137. [o] Ath. ad Sol p. 141. & 842. [p] Idem ib. [q] Idem de frag. p. 70. & apol 2. p. 807. [r] Vide Iſidor. de vir. ill. in Oſio. c. 1.

of *Auguſt* [r]; but they are certainly miſtaken in ſuppoſing him to have died in Baniſhment. The Caſe of *Oſius* deſerveth, without all Doubt, to be greatly pitied. But it would be ſtill more worthy of our Pity and Compaſſion, had he been himſelf an Enemy to all Perſecution. But it muſt be obſerved, that he was the Author and Promoter of the Firſt Chriſtian Perſecution. For it was he who firſt ſtirred up *Conſtantine* againſt the *Donatiſts*; many of whom were ſent into Exile, and ſome even ſentenced to Death, nay, and led to the Place of Execution. I dare not interpret the very ſevere Treatment he met with, or his Fall and Apoſtaſy, as a Judgment; but cannot help thinking him, on that Conſideration, leſs worthy of our Compaſſion and Concern, than a Man of his Years and Merit would otherwiſe have been.

Conſtantius appoints a Council to meet at Nicomedia;

Conſtantius having thus gained over to the Heterodox Party the celebrated Biſhop of *Cordoua*, and ſent thoſe into Exile, whom he apprehended moſt capable of traverſing his Deſign, reſolved to aſſemble a Council, not doubting but he ſhould be able, by ſome means or other, to prevail upon the Members, that compoſed it, to approve and embrace the Doctrine, which he was labouring with indefatigable Pains to eſtabliſh. Accordingly he wrote to the chief Biſhops of each Province, enjoining them to meet in the Name of the reſt, at an appointed Time, in the City of *Nicomedia* [s]. In Compliance with his Orders the Biſhops immediately ſet out; but, while they were on the Road, they were ſtopped by the News that was brought them of the utter Deſtruction of the City of *Nicomedia* by a ſudden and moſt dreadful Earthquake. This public Calamity happened on the 24th of *Auguſt* 358 [u], and the *Arians*, in the Account which they tranſmitted of it to Court, aſſured the Emperor that ſeveral Biſhops, who were for

which City is deſtroyed by an Earthquake.

Con-

[r] Menæa, p. 293. [s] Soz. l. 4. c. 16. & l. 3. c. 19. Ath. de ſyn. p. 873. [u] Greg. Nyſſ. de facto, p. 75.

Conſubſtantiality, had been buried under the Ruins of the great Church[w]. It was probably by this Account, that *Philoſtorgius* was deceived and miſled, when he wrote that Fifteen Biſhops, who were all Defenders of *Conſubſtantiality*, were cruſhed to Pieces by the Fall of the Church, together with *Cecrops*, Biſhop of the City[x]. But *Sozomen* aſſureth us, that, when the Church fell, there was not a ſingle Perſon in it, and that Two Biſhops only periſhed in the Earthquake, *viz. Cecrops*, who was an *Arian*, and a Biſhop of *Boſporus*[y]. This Misfortune obliged the Emperor to change the Place of the Council; and accordingly Letters were immediately diſpatched to all the Biſhops, ordering them to repair to *Nice*, which City was ſuggeſted to him by *Baſilius*, the *Semi-Arian* Biſhop of *Ancyra*, with a Deſign, ſaith *Theodoret*[z], to eclipſe the Glory and Authority of the Firſt Council by the Confuſion of Two. Be that as it will, the Biſhops were ordered to meet there early in the Summer of the Year 359. Such as were not in a Condition to undertake ſuch a Journey, on account of their Age or Infirmities, were to ſend Prieſts or Deacons, as their Deputies, to vote and act in their Name; and the Council was ſtrictly enjoined to tranſmit to the Emperor ſuch Decrees as they ſhould enact, that he might examine them, and ſee whether they were agreeable to Scripture: for this Purpoſe Ten Deputies were to be appointed by the Biſhops of the Eaſt, and the like Number by thoſe of the Weſt[a]. But while the World was expecting to ſee a ſecond Oecumenical Council aſſembled at *Nice*, the Emperer all on a ſudden changed his Mind, and inſtead of one, reſolved to convene Two, the one in the Eaſt, and the other in the Weſt[b]. This Change was owing to the Intrigues of the *Anomeans* or *Pure Arians*, who finding the far greater Part

The Council appointed to meet at Nice.

Two Councils appointed to meet inſtead of one.

w Soz. ib. x Philoſt. l. 4. c. 20. y Soz. ib. z Theodor. l. 1. c. 22. a Soz. l. 4. c. 16. Ath. de ſyn. p. 869. b Ath. de ſyn. p. 870.

Part of the Biſhops either for the orthodox Faith of *Nice*, or the *Semi-Arian*, as eſtabliſhed in a Council at *Antioch*, concluded, that there would be no Means to divert them, when aſſembled together, from condemning their Doctrine; whereas if they were divided, they did not deſpair of being able to manage both Aſſemblies, or at leaſt one of the Two[c]. This Deſign of dividing the Council they privately imparted to the Eunuch *Euſebius*, their great Friend, and the Emperor's chief Favourite, who, highly applauding the Scheme, took upon him to get it approved by *Conſtantius*. And this he eaſily effected, by repreſenting, that a General Council would put the Biſhops to greater Trouble and Inconveniences than moſt of them could well bear, and, at the ſame Time, the Treaſury to an immenſe Charge; for on ſuch Occaſions their Expences were defrayed by the Emperor[d]. He therefore adviſed him to aſſemble Two Councils at the ſame time, one in the Eaſt, and the other in the Weſt, which, he ſaid, would be leſs troubleſome to the Biſhops, and leſs expenſive to the Exchequer. To theſe Reaſons *Conſtantius* acquieſced; but, as he was a zealous *Semi-Arian*, *Euſebius* kept him in the Dark, as to the true Motive of ſuch a Change. Thus was *Conſtantius*, and thus have many Princes been, ſince his Time, led, as it were hoodwinked, by ſome, in whom they repoſed an intire Confidence, into Meaſures tending to promote Deſigns quite oppoſite to their own.

The Occaſion of this Change.

This Point being ſettled, to the great Satisfaction of the *Anomeans*, *Ariminum*, now *Rimini*, on the *Adriatic* Sea, was thought the moſt proper Place for the Weſtern Biſhops to meet at. But the City of *Nice*, where the General Council was to aſſemble, having ſuffered much by the late Earthquake, the Emperor deſired the Eaſtern Biſhops might not meet there,

Rimini choſen for the Weſtern Biſhops.

[c] Ath. de ſyn p. 873, 874. Soz. l. 4. c. 16. [d] Idem ib. & c. 17.

there, but in whatever other Place they ſhould agree among themſelves to be the moſt proper and convenient[e]. This *Theodoret* aſcribeth to a particular Providence, that would not ſuffer the great Council of *Nice* to be ever confounded with a Conventicle of Heretics[f]. As the Biſhops could not agree about the Place, and it was not at all probable they ſhould, the Emperor, by the Advice of a few, who were then with him at *Sirmium*, named the City of *Seleucia* in *Iſauria*[g]. And now that the Place was ſettled for both Councils, *Conſtantius* iſſued an Order, enjoining not only the chief Biſhops of each Province, as he had done the Year before, but all, without Exception, to repair to one of the Two[h]; nay, he diſpatched Officers into the Provinces, with a ſtrict Charge to ſee this Order punctually obeyed, and put in Execution[i]. The Biſhops therefore ſet out from all Parts; the public Carriages, Roads, and Houſes, were every-where crouded with them; which gave great Offence to the Catechumens; and no ſmall Diverſion to the Pagans, who thought it equally ſtrange and ridiculous, that Men, who had been brought up from their Infancy in the Chriſtian Religion, and whoſe Buſineſs it was to inſtruct others in that Belief, ſhould be conſtantly hurrying, in their old Age, from one Place to another, to know what they themſelves ſhould believe[k]. *Ammianus Marcellinus* complains, that the neceſſary Funds for the Maintenance of the public Carriages were quite drained and exhauſted, by the roaming about of the Chriſtian Biſhops[l]. Their Charges were defrayed by the Emperor, as I have obſerved above; but the Biſhops of *Gaul* and *Britain*, that they might be the more independent, inſiſted upon travelling at their own Expence; only Three of the latter, not having wherewithal to ſupport themſelves, choſe rather to be obliged,

Seleucia in Iſauria *choſen for the Eaſtern Biſhops.*

[e] Soz. l. 4. c. 24. [f] Theod. l. 2. c. 21. [g] Socr. l. 2. c. 39. Soz. l. 4. c. 16. [h] Hil. de ſyn. p. 24. [i] Sulp. l. 2. p. 164. [k] Ath. de ſyn. p. 870. [l] Ammian l. 21. p. 203.

liged to the Emperor than burdenſome to their Collegues, who generouſly offered to contribute to their Maintenance, every one according to his Ability [m].

The Weſtern Biſhops, that is, thoſe of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, *Africa*, *Spain*, *Gaul*, and *Britain*, being aſſembled at *Rimini*, in all 400 and upwards [o], the Emperor wrote to *Taurus*, the *Præfectus Prætorio* of *Italy*, charging him to be preſent at all the Debates, and not to ſuffer the Biſhops to ſeparate, until, in Points of Faith, they had all agreed: if he ſucceeded therein he was to be rewarded with the Conſular Dignity [p].

The Emperor's Letter to the Weſtern Biſhops.

At the ſame time he wrote to the Biſhops, injoining them to treat only of ſuch Matters as related to the Faith, Unity, and Order of the Church, and forbidding them to meddle, on any Pretence whatſoever, with what concerned the Eaſtern Biſhops, who, he ſaid, would take care to ſettle their own Affairs, ſince they were met for that Purpoſe [q]. This was to prevent their entering upon the Cauſe of *Athanaſius*, whom he well knew the Weſtern Biſhops would have declared innocent. The Emperor's Letter is dated the 27th of *May* 359 [r]. At this Council *Reſtitutus*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, is ſuppoſed to have preſided, as he was, both for Piety and Learning, the moſt conſpicuous in the Aſſembly. At their firſt Meeting, the two *Arian* Biſhops, *Urſacius* and *Valens*, appeared with a Paper in their Hands, containing a new Confeſſion of Faith, compoſed lately at *Sirmium* by the Emperor, by a ſmall Number of *Arian* and *Semi-Arian* Biſhops, and ſeveral Preſbyters and Deacons, who, after a Debate, which laſted the whole Day, had at length agreed to ſuppreſs the Word *Conſubſtantial*, and introduce the Word *like* in its room; ſo that the Son was no more to be ſaid *conſubſtantial*, but *like to the Father in all things*; the three laſt Words *Conſtantius* added, and, by obliging all who were

The Arians propoſe a new Confeſſion, drawn up at Sirmium.

[m] Sulp. l. 4. c. 17. [o] Ath. de ſyn. p. 874. Sulp. l. 2. p. 162. Soz. p. 563. [p] Hier. p. 143. Sulp. p. 162. [q] Hil. frag. 2. p. 43, 44. [r] Idem. ib. p. 46.

were preſent to ſign them, defeated, ſay the *Semi-Arians*, the wicked Deſigns of the Heretics, meaning the *Pure Arians* [r]. However, excepting thoſe Words, the whole Confeſſion was thought to favour their Doctrine [t]; whence the *Semi-Arians* held out until Night, when the Emperor, well ſatisfied with the Words, *like in all things*, obliged them to ſign it. This Confeſſion of Faith was drawn up, and ſigned, on the Eve of *Pentecoſt* [u], that is, on the 22d or 23d of *May* 359 [w], *Eaſter* having fallen that Year on the 4th of *April* [x] (D). *Urſacius* and *Valens* read it to the Council, adding, when they had done, that

[r] Ath. de ſyn. p. 876. Hil. frag. 1. p. 44. Epiph. hæreſ. 73. c. 22. [t] Hil. & Epiph. ib. [u] Idem ib. [w] Ath de ſyn. p. 875. [x] Buch. cycl.

(D) It was ſigned by the few Biſhops, who were preſent, and by a good Number of Preſbyters and Deacons. The Biſhops were *Marcus* of *Arethuſa*, *George*, who had been intruded into the See of *Alexandria*, *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, *Germinius* of *Sirmium*, *Hypatianus* of *Heraclea*, *Valens*, *Urſacius*, and *Pancratius* of *Peluſium* (1). *Valens*, in ſigning it, added to his Name theſe Words; *I believe the Son to be like the Father*. He was unwilling to acknowledge the Son like to the Father *in all things*, agreeably to the Confeſſion, which he was to ſign, and therefore ſuppreſſed theſe Words. But the Emperor inſiſting upon his adding them, he took his Will for the Rule of his Faith, and added them accordingly. *Baſilius* of *Ancyra*, ſuſpecting ſome Meaning contrary to the Doctrine which he held, to lie concealed and diſguiſed under thoſe Words, declared, that he underſtood by them a Likeneſs in *Subſtance*, in *Exiſtence*, and in *Eſſence*; and that he ſigned in this, and no other Senſe, the preſent Symbol. Not ſatisfied with this Declaration, he wrote, ſome time after, an Expoſition of the Faith that was profeſſed by him, and the other *Semi-Arian* Biſhops. This Expoſition is, by *Epiphanius*, ſtyled a Letter, and was placed by him after the circular Letter of the Council of *Ancyra*. The preſent Confeſſion of *Sirmium* is commonly ſtyled the Third, but was, properly ſpeaking, the Fourth: For before this, Three different Symbols had been compoſed at *Sirmium*; *viz.* one intirely Orthodox, in 351; another altogether *Arian*, in 357; a third *Semi-Arian*, in 358; and the preſent in 359. The Second *Liberius* ſigned at *Beræa*, and the Third at *Sirmium*, upon his Arrival in that City.

(1) Athan. de ſyn. p. 873. Epi. 73. c. 22, Socr. l. 2. c. 29.

that it had been approved of by the Emperor, and therefore that they ought all to be satisfied with it, without recurring to any other Councils or Creeds, without demanding any other Confession of the Heretics, or enquiring too narrowly into their Doctrine and Opinions, which would be attended with much Trouble, endless Disputes, and eternal Divisions; that the Catholic Truths, which all Men were bound to believe, ought not to be darkened with Metaphysical Terms, but expressed by Words, which all Men understood; and, lastly, that it was quite idle to quarrel and make so much Noise about a Word (meaning the Word *consubstantial*) which none of the inspired Writers had thought fit to make use of in explaining the Mysteries of our holy Religion [y]. What Answer the Council returned I can find nowhere recorded. But a Motion being made soon after to condemn and anathematize the *Arian* and all other Heresies, *Ursacius* and his Party opposed it; which alarmed the Orthodox Bishops, concluding from thence, that whatever Expressions they made use of, their Belief was different from that of the Catholic Church. They therefore resolved to hearken to them no longer; and accordingly, without the least Regard to their Remonstrances and Protestations, they condemned, with one Consent, all Heresies in general, and that of *Arius* in particular; declared heretical the Confession of Faith presented by *Ursacius* and *Valens*; confirmed that of *Nice*, and ordered the Word *consubstantial* to be retained, since the true Meaning of it might be sufficiently gathered from several Passages in Scripture [z]. They did not stop here, but, transported with Zeal on the *Arians* attempting to impose upon them by a Second Confession of Faith, they declared them all, and their Leaders *Ursacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and *Caius*, by Name,

which is rejected.

and they condemned and deposed.

[y] Ath. Soz. ib. Theod. l. 1. c. 15. [z] Ath. ib. p. 876. Soz. ib. Hil. frag. 2. p. 47, 48.

Name, ignorant and deceitful Men, Impoſtors, Heretics, depoſed them in the Council, and ſigned all to a Man this Declaration on the 21ſt of *July* of the preſent Year 359[a].

With this Act they put an End to the Seſſions, and immediately diſpatched Ten Deputies to acquaint the Emperor with what had paſſed, purſuant to his expreſs Command. The like Number was ſent by the *Arians*, who had aſſiſted at the Council. Theſe, travelling with great Expedition, arrived at *Conſtantinople*, where the Court then was, ſome time before the others, and being immediately admitted to the Emperor, they prejudiced him to ſuch a Degree againſt the orthodox Party, that he would not ſo much as ſee their Deputies, pretending to be wholly taken up with the Affairs of the State. They were therefore obliged to deliver the Letter, which the Council had wrote on this Occaſion to one of his Miniſters[b]. They expected every Day to be admitted to an Audience, or, at leaſt, to receive an Anſwer, and be diſmiſſed. But, after they had been thus kept for ſome time in Expectation, the Emperor all on a ſudden left *Conſtantinople*, in order to head his Army againſt the *Barbarians*, who had broken into the Empire. He was no ſooner gone than one of the Miniſters came to acquaint them, that it was the Emperor's Pleaſure they ſhould repair forthwith to *Adrianople*, and there wait his Return[c]. However, before he ſet out, he wrote to the Council, giving them notice of his ſudden Departure from *Conſtantinople*; and alledging, by way of Excuſe, for not having ſeen or heard their Deputies, the preſent Situation of public Affairs, which had engroſſed his whole Attention; whereas, the diſcuſſing and ſettleing of ſpiritual Affairs required a Mind quite free and diſengaged from all worldly Cares. He concluded his

Deputies ſent by the Council to the Emperor.

who leaveth Conſtantinople without ſeeing them.

[a] Ath. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 37. Hil. frag. 2. p. 46. [b] Sulp. l. 2. c. 163. Ath. ad Afr. p. 934. Hil. frag. 2. p. 36. [c] Socr. ib. Ath. de ſyn. p. 930.

He endeavours to tire their Patience with Delays.

his ſhort Letter with intreating them not to think of ſeparating until he was at Leiſure to ſettle, in Conjunction with them, Matters of ſo great Importance to the Church, and the whole Chriſtian World [d]. The Deſign of the moſt wicked *Conſtantius*, as *Athanaſius* ſtyleth him [e], was to tire out the Biſhops with ſuch Delays, hoping they would, in the End, chuſe rather to ſign the laſt *Sirmian* Confeſſion, which he was bent upon eſtabliſhing in the room of the *Nicene*, than to be long kept, as it were, in Exile, at a Diſtance from their Sees [f]. But this he could not compaſs for the preſent, the Biſhops declaring, in their Anſwer to his Letter, that they could not, and hoped that they never ſhould, upon any Conſideration whatſoever, depart from what they had ſo unanimouſly ſettled and decreed [g]. *Socrates* writes, that the Biſhops, after having waited ſome time in vain for the Emperor's Anſwer to their Letter, left *Rimini*, and retired to their reſpective Sees [h]. And here he endeth his Account of that Council, It were greatly to be wiſhed, that nothing elſe could be ſaid of it; but ſeveral cotemporary and unexceptionable Writers, and *Hilarius* among the reſt [i], aſſureth us, that *Conſtantius changed at laſt the Faith of the Weſtern Biſhops into Impiety*. Of this deplorable Change they give us the following Account.

Their Deputies ordered to Nice *in* Thrace;

The *Arians*, taking Occaſion from the laſt Letter of the Biſhops at *Rimini* to incenſe *Conſtantius* againſt them, prevailed upon him to order their Deputies to a City in *Thrace*, known at that Time by the Name of *Nice*, but formerly called *Oſtudizus*, and placed by *Sanſon* a few Leagues to the Eaſt of *Adrianople*. This Place they choſe, that the Symbol, which they deſigned to impoſe upon them, might be confounded by the ignorant People with that of the great Council of *Nice* in *Bithynia* [k]. The Deputies no ſooner

[d] Ath. de ſyn. p. 929, 930. [e] Id. ib. [f] Theod. l. 2. c. 15, 16. [g] Id. ib. [h] Soc. l. 2. c. 3. [i] Hil. in conſ. l. 1. p. 113. [k] Theod. l. 2. c. 16. Hil. in ann. p. 122.

ſooner arrived there, than a Confeſſion of Faith was propoſed to them intirely agreeable to the laſt made at *Sirmium*, except that in this new Creed the Son was declared *like to the Father*, without the Addition of the Words *in all things*. This they rejected at firſt with great Reſolution and intrepidity; but the *Arians* were no leſs reſolute, and therefore left nothing unattempted they could think of to carry their Point[l]. But finding Hope and Fear, Threats and Promiſes, equally ineffectual, they proceeded at laſt to open Force and Violence[m]. What Kind of Violence was employed againſt them, the Author doth not tell us; but *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus* aſcribe their retracting what they had declared to be holy, and approving what they had condemned as impious, to the Love of their Sees, and the Dread they were in of being driven from them[n]. Be that as it will, it is certain that they yielded at laſt; that they accepted and ſigned, without the leaſt Limitation or Reſtriction, the above-mentioned Confeſſion of Faith; conſented to the Suppreſſion of the Word *Conſubſtantial*; declared void and null all the Acts and Proceedings of the Council of *Rimini*; anathematized, as heretical, all Opinions contrary to the Doctrine contained in the ſaid Confeſſion; and, finally, admitted to their Communion *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and *Caius*, whom they had not long before depoſed as Heretics[o]. *Reſtitutus*, Biſhop of *Carthage*, and one of the moſt eminent Prelates at that Time in the Church, ſigned the firſt, and the other Deputies after him, according to the Dignity of their Sees. The Emperor, tranſported with Joy at the News of their Compliance, which he looked upon as a ſignal Victory, gave them immediately Leave to return to *Rimini*. At the ſame time he wrote to *Taurus*, charging him anew not to ſuffer the Biſhops

where they ſign the Sirmian Confeſſion.

[l] Id. ib. [m] Hil. frag. 2. p. 23. [n] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 25. [o] Hil. frag. 2 p. 36, 37. Theod. ib. Sulp. l. 2. p. 165.

Bishops to depart till they had all signed the same Confession of Faith, and impowering him to send into Exile such as by their Obstinacy should distinguish themselves above the rest, provided they were not above Fifteen in Number [p]. He likewise wrote to the Bishops, commanding them, on pain of incurring his Indignation, to suppress for ever the Words *Substance* and *consubstantial*, severely reprimanding them for presuming to depose *Ursacius* and his Collegues, and assuring them, that they should not be allowed to return to their Sees, until they had intitled themselves to his Favour by an intire and unreserved Compliance with his Will [q]. To this Letter the *Arians*, who had assisted at the Council, to the Number of Eighty, returned a most submissive Answer, and even thanked the Emperor for the great Pains he took to establish the true Doctrine [r]. However, *Taurus* declared that he could by no means suffer them to depart until the rest had agreed with them, and the whole Assembly was of one Mind. The orthodox Bishops shewed at first some Resolution, and even refused to communicate with their own Deputies. But this Resolution soon vanished; they were eager to return to their Sees; the Emperor was inflexible; *Taurus* took care to render the Place both inconvenient and disagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their Example, the rest began to waver, and, being so far got the better of, yielded soon after, and went over to the *Arian* Party in such Crouds, that in a very short time the Number of the orthodox Bishops, who continued steady, was reduced to 20 [s]. At the Head of these was *Phœbadius*, the celebrated Bishop of *Agen*, who seemed invincible; but nevertheless was overcome in the End, not by the Menaces of the Emperor, or his Præfect, but by the Craft and Subtilty of *Ursacius*

Constantius orders the Bishops at Rimini to suppress the Words Substance *and* Consubstantial.

The greater Part yield.

[p] Athan. ad Afr. p. 941. Sulp. p. 165. Marc. & Faust. p. 26. Hil. frag. p. 37. [q] Ath. ib. p. 934. [r] Hil. frag. 2. p. 37, 38. [s] Sulp. p. 166.

Urſacius and *Valens*, who, finding they could by no other Means prevail upon him to accept the *Sirmian* Confeſſion, declared, that, to put an End to the unhappy Diviſions that had ſo long rent the Church, they had at laſt reſolved to agree to ſuch Alterations and Additions as ſhould be judged proper and neceſſary by him and his Collegues. This Declaration was received by all with great Joy: *Phœbadius* triumphed, thinking he had carried his Point, and ſaved the Reputation of the Council. To the Symbol were immediately added ſeveral Anathemas againſt the *Arian* Hereſy, and an Article declaring *the Son equal to the Father, without Beginning, and before all Time.* When this Article was read, *Valens* deſired, that, in order to leave no room for new Diſputes or Chicanery, they would add, that *the Son was not a Creature like other Creatures*[t]. This was evidently ſuppoſing the Son to be a Creature only exalted above all other Creatures; ſo that by admiting ſuch an Article they condemned the Doctrine which they deſigned to eſtabliſh, and eſtabliſhed that which they deſigned to condemn. And yet of this neither was *Phœbadius* aware, nor any of his Party, as they afterwards ſolemnly declared[u]. A moſt unaccountable Overſight, and hardly credible! But *Theodoret*[w], *Ambroſe*[x], *Sulpitius Severus*[y], and *Fulgentius*[z], took it upon their Word, and ſo muſt we. Neither Party could brag of the Victory; for the *Arians* had anathematized the Hereſy of *Arius*; and on the other hand the orthodox Biſhops had deliberately agreed to the ſuppreſſing of the Words *Subſtance* and *Conſubſtantial*, and inadvertently acknowleged the Son to be a Creature; which was all the *Arians* aimed at, or could deſire. The Council being thus ended, new Deputies were ſent to acquaint the

The other's impoſed upon by the Arians.

[t] Sulp. ib. [u] Theod. l. 1. c. 17. [w] Id. ib. [x] Ambroſ. de fid. l. 3. c. 7. [y] Sulp. l. 2. p. 166. [z] Fulg. in Pint. c. 3. p. 536.

the Emperor with what had paſſed, who, being highly pleaſed with the Report made by *Urſacius* and *Valens*, (for they were at the Head of the Deputation) immediately granted the Biſhops Leave to return to their reſpective Sees, after they had been about Four Months at *Rimini*.

The Council no ſooner broke up than the *Arians* began to proclaim aloud the Victory they had gained, bragging, that it had not been defined in the Council of *Rimini*, that the Son was not a Creature, but only that he was not like other Creatures; and declaring it was, and had always been, their Opinion, that the Son was no more like the Father, than a Piece of Glaſs was like an Emerald [a]. *Phœbadius*, and the other Biſhops who had adhered to him, were returned to their Sees with great Joy, flattering themſelves that they had ſufficiently eſtabliſhed the Catholic Doctrine, and prevented all future Diſputes: but, finding that the *Arians* pretended their Tenets had been confirmed by this very Council, and ſeriouſly reflecting on the Articles, which they themſelves had agreed to, they diſcovered at laſt how groſly they had been impoſed upon, and publicly retracted all they had ſaid, done, or ſigned, repugnant to the Truths of the Catholic Church [b]. However, *Gregory* Biſhop of *Elvira* refuſed to communicate with any of the Biſhops who had aſſiſted at the Council of *Rimini*, and was on that account commended by *Euſebius* of *Vercelli* [c]. The exiled Biſhops, and thoſe, who lay concealed, agreed among themſelves by Letters, to declare them for ever incapable of performing any Epiſcopal or Sacerdotal Functions, and to admit them to the Communion of the Church only in the Capacity of Laymen [d]. When Peace was reſtored to the Church by the Death of *Conſtantius* in 361, moſt of the orthodox Biſhops were

They diſcover their Miſtake.

Are judged guilty by the exiled Biſhops.

[a] Hil. frag. 1. p. 53, 54. [b] Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. [c] Hil. frag. 2. p. 4, 5. [d] Mar. & Fauſt. p. 47.

were for depoſing all thoſe of the Council of *Rimini*, and placing others in their room. But this Sentence the People would not ſuffer to be put in Execution, riſing every-where in Defence of their Paſtors, and in ſome Places inſulting, beating, and even killing, thoſe who came to depoſe them [e].

As for the Council of *Seleucia*, it met on the 27th of *September* 359, and conſiſted only of One hundred and Sixty Biſhops, all *Arians*, or *Semi-Arians*, except Twelve or Thirteen orthodox Biſhops from *Egypt* [f]. This Aſſembly *Gregory Nazianzen* calls the *Tower* of *Calane*, or *Babel*, the Council of *Caiaphas* [g]. And indeed with a great deal of Reaſon; for nothing was there ſeen but Tumult, Confuſion, and Diſorder. The *Anomeans* and *Semi-Arians* appeared ſo irreconcilably incenſed againſt each other, and carried on their Debates with ſo much Animoſity and Bitterneſs, that the Quæſtor *Leonas*, whom the Emperor had appointed to aſſiſt at the Council, thinking it impoſſible they ſhould ever agree in any one Point, roſe up at their Fourth Meeting, while they were in the Heat of the Diſpute, and, withdrawing abruptly, put an End to that Seſſion, nay, and to the Council; for, being invited the next Day, the Firſt of *October*, to the Aſſembly, he refuſed to go, ſaying, that he did not conceive his Preſence to be at all neceſſary, ſince they might quarrel and ſcold as much as they pleaſed without him [h]. This he did, ſaith *Sozomen*, to favour the *Anomeans*, who thence took Occaſion to abſent themſelves from the Council, which, as it was chiefly compoſed of *Semi-Arians*, ſeemed determined to condemn their Doctrine [i]. However, the *Semi-Arians* met by themſelves; and, finding they could by no means prevail upon the *Anomeans* to return to the Council, they condemned their Doctrine as heretical

Great Diſagreement in the Council of Seleucia.

The Semi-Arians *condemn and depoſe the* Arians.

[e] Hier. ib. [f] Ath. de ſyn. p. 881. Hil. in conſ. l. 1. p. 114. [g] Greg. Naz. or. 21. p. 386. [h] Socr. l. 2. c. 40. [i] Soz. l. 4. c. 22.

tical and blaſphemous, excommunicated and depoſed the leading Men of their Party, appointed others in their room, and gave notice thereof to their reſpective Churches[k]. Before they broke up, they diſpatched Ten Deputies to acquaint the Emperor with the Tranſactions of the Council. But the Biſhops, whom they had depoſed, arriving at Court before them, and being by their Friends there immediately introduced to *Conſtantius*, they prejudiced him againſt the Council of *Seleucia* to ſuch a Degree, that it was ſome Time before he could prevail upon himſelf to hear the Deputies. However, he heard them at laſt, and, by threatening them with Exile if they did not comply, obliged them to ſign the laſt Confeſſion of *Sirmium*, which had been rejected by the Council as *Arian*[l]. In this he ſpent the whole Day, and great part of the Night, preceding the Firſt of *January*, although he was obliged to make the neceſſary Preparations for entering on that Day his Tenth Conſulate with the uſual Pomp and Solemnity[m].

They ſign the laſt Confeſſion of Sirmium.

In the Beginning of the Year 360, the *Anomeans* aſſembling by themſelves at *Conſtantinople*, as the *Semi-Arians* had done at *Seleucia*, in order to ingratiate themſelves with the Emperor, not only received the laſt *Sirmian* Confeſſion, but condemned all other Confeſſions or Symbols that had been made until then, or ſhould be made for the future. They then declared all the Acts of the Council of *Seleucia* void and null; and to be even with the *Semi-Arians*, depoſed, under various Pretences, ſuch of their Party as had moſt contributed to the depoſing of them, and even prevailed upon the Emperor to ſend them into Exile[n].

The Arians, *in their Turn, condemn and depoſe the* Semi arians; *and alſo ſign the laſt Confeſſion of* Sirmium.

They did not ſtop here, but obtained of *Conſtantius* an Order, which was publiſhed throughout the Empire,

[k] Id. ib. Socr. l. 1. c. 40. Ath. de ſyn. p. 881. Baſil in Eunom. l. 1. p. 697. Sulp. l. 1. p. 165. [l] Hil. in conſ. l. 1. p. 115. Soz. l. 4. c. 23. Baſil. ep. 74. [m] Soz. l. 4. c. 24. [n] Socr. l. 2. c. 12. Soz. l. 4. c. 24. Philoſt. l. 5. c. 1.

Empire, commanding all Biſhops to ſign the *Sirmian* Confeſſion, on pain of forfeiting their Dignity, and being ſent into Exile [o] (A). This Order was executed with the utmoſt Rigour in all the Provinces of the Empire, and very few were found, who did not ſign with their Hands what they condemned in their Hearts [p]. Many, who until then had been thought invincible, were overcome, and complied with the Times; and ſuch as did not, were driven, without Diſtinction, from their Sees, into Exile, and others appointed in their room, the ſigning of that Confeſſion being a Qualification indiſpenſably requiſite both for obtaining and keeping the Epiſcopal Dignity [q]. Thus were all the Sees throughout the Empire filled with *Arians*, inſomuch that in the whole Eaſt not one orthodox Biſhop was left; and in the Weſt but One, *viz. Gregory* Biſhop of *Elvira* in *Andaluſia*, and he, in all Likelihood, obliged to abſent himſelf from his Flock, and lie concealed, as were probably Pope *Liberius*,

The Emperor injoineth all Biſhops to ſign the Sirmian *Confeſſion.*

[o] Soz. l. 4. c. 26. [p] Greg. Naz. orat. 21. p. 387. [q] Id. ib.

(A) This Confeſſion is called ſometimes the *Confeſſion of* Nice *in* Thrace, and ſometimes the *Confeſſion of* Rimini; but it differed from both. By the Confeſſion of *Nice*, the Son was acknowleged to be like to the Father, without the Addition of the Words *in all things*, which were an eſſential Part of the laſt Confeſſion of *Sirmium*. In that of *Rimini* the Son was ſaid *not to be a Creature like other Creatures*, and there were no ſuch Words in the Confeſſion of *Sirmium*. But by all Three the Word *Conſubſtantial* was rejected, and no other would ſatisfy the Orthodox, acknowleging the Son to be *of the ſame Subſtance with the Father*. Both the *Arians* and *Semi-Arians* allowed the Son to be like to the Father: but that Likeneſs was by them very differently underſtood and interpreted. The *Arians* held him to be *like* rather by Grace than by Nature, and as like as a Creature could be to the Creator (1). The *Semi-Arians* confeſſed him to be like in *Nature*, in *Exiſtence*, in *Eſſence*, in *Subſtance*, and in *every thing elſe*. But the Orthodox maintained him to be of the *ſame Subſtance* with the Father, and conſequently of the *ſame Exiſtence*, *Eſſence*, &c. and to expreſs this *Sameneſs* or *Identity*, they choſe the Word *Conſubſtantial*.

(1) Ruff. l. 1. c. 25.

Liberius, and *Vincentius* of *Capua*, if what *Theodoret* relateth of them be true, *viz.* that they never consented to the Decrees of *Rimini*[r], and thereby retrieved the Reputation they had loſt, the former, by ſigning the *Sirmian* Confeſſion of the Year 357, and the other by communicating with the *Arians* in 353, as I have related above. But what *Theodoret* writeth may be juſtly called in queſtion; for it is not at all probable, that the Emperor, and the *Arian* Party, ſo warmly bent on eſtabliſhing that Confeſſion throughout the Empire, would have ſuffered the Biſhop of the Imperial City of the firſt See to reject it, without depoſing him, as they had the Biſhops of all the other great Sees, and appointing another more compliant in his room. This could not be prevented by his concealing himſelf in the Caverns and Cœmeteries about *Rome*, as he is ſaid to have done in his Acts quoted by *Baronius*[s], although he might by that means have eſcaped being ſent into Exile. Beſides, had he, inſtead of complying with the Emperor's expreſs Command, withdrawn and abſconded, I cannot think that his Antagoniſt *Felix*, who was ſtill alive, and had done nothing we know of to diſoblige the Emperor, and the *Arian* Party, by whom he had been formerly raiſed to that See, would have neglected ſo favourable an Opportunity of recovering his antient Dignity. If what *Theodoret* ſaith be true, *Gregory Nazianzen* is highly to blame for not excepting *Liberius*, when he wrote, that the Biſhops either all complied, or were driven into Exile, excepting a few, who were too inſignificant to be taken notice of by the Emperor, or his Miniſters[u]. Be that as it will, it is certain, that, at this time, the *Arian* Doctrine univerſally obtained; that the Face of the Church appeared quite deformed and diſfigured[w]; that the whole World ſaw itſelf, with Aſtoniſhment,

It was probably ſigned by Liberius.

Arianiſm *univerſally obtains.*

[r] Theod. l. 2 c. 17. [s] Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 48. [u] Greg. Naz. orat. 1. p. 387. [w] Ruf. l. 1. c. 21.

niſhment, all on a ſudden become *Arian*[x]; that the Boat of St. *Peter*, to uſe St. *Jerom*'s Expreſſion, toſſed by furious Winds, by violent Storms, was upon the Point of ſinking, and no Hopes of Safety ſeemed to be left[y].

The following Year 361, the *Anomeans*, not fully ſatisfied with the Confeſſion of Faith, which, at their Suggeſtion, the Emperor had taken ſo much Pains to eſtabliſh throughout the Empire, aſſembled, with his Leave, at *Antioch*, and there drew up a new Symbol, or Creed, wherein it was expreſly ſaid, that *the Son was in every thing unlike to the Father*, and that *He was made out of nothing*. *Conſtantius* had formerly expreſſed the greateſt Abhorrence to this Doctrine, and had even baniſhed thoſe who held, and refuſed to anathematize, ſuch *impious Blaſphemies*, as he then ſtyled them[z]. But, having lately changed his Opinion, which was chiefly owing to the great Influence the Eunuch *Euſebius* had over him, he was now no leſs ſanguine for the *Unlikeneſs* of the Son to the Father, than he had been hitherto for the *Likeneſs*[a]. In order therefore to aboliſh the antient, and eſtabliſh this new Creed in its room, he appointed a Council to meet at *Nice* in *Bithynia*[b], which, without all Doubt, he would have treated in the ſame manner as he had done that of *Rimini*. But, as the Biſhops were preparing to ſet out for the appointed Place, they were ſtopped by the ſudden and unexpected News of the Emperor's Death, which put an End to all his Councils, and was heard with equal Joy by thoſe of the *Orthodox* and *Semi-Arian* Party. He was ſucceeded by *Julian*, ſurnamed the *Apoſtate*, who immediately recalled all thoſe who had been baniſhed by *Conſtantius*, on account of their Religion[c]. Whatever was his Motive, the Church reaped great Advan-

Conſtantius deſigns to eſtabliſh the Doctrine of the Pure Arians;

but is prevented by Death.

[x] Hier. in Lucifer. p. 143. & in chron. [y] Idem ib. [z] Theod. l. 2. c. 23. [a] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. Ath. de ſyn. p. 906. [b] Philoſt. l. 6. c. 5. [c] Socr. l. 3. c. 1.

The exiled Biſhops recalled by Julian.

Advantages from the Return of ſo many eminent Prelates, who, in the worſt of Times, had, with an invincible Firmneſs and Conſtancy, ſtood up in her Defence. Among the reſt returned, on this Occaſion, the famous *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch*, *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, who had been all Three confined to the moſt diſtant Parts of *Thebais* in *Egypt*, *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Pelagius* of *Laodicea* in *Phœnicia*, and to the inexpreſſible Joy of the Orthodox Party, their great Champion *Athanaſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* [e], who immediately reſumed, undiſturbed, his Epiſcopal Functions; *George*, the Uſurper of his See, having been aſſaſſinated a little while before by the Pagans of *Alexandria*, on account of his Avarice and Cruelty [f]. In other Places the orthodox Biſhops, finding the *Arians* in Poſſeſſion of their Sees, contented themſelves with being acknowleged by thoſe of their Communion, without attempting to drive out their Antagoniſts, which would have created great Confuſion, and endleſs Diſturbances, in the Church. *Julian* refuſed to interpoſe his Authority in favour of either Party, ſaying, that as he was not ſo well acquainted with the Nature of their Diſputes as a juſt and impartial Judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuſe him, leſt he ſhould be guilty of ſome Injuſtice, and ſettle Matters of ſuch Importance among themſelves. *Athanaſius* entered *Alexandria* in a kind of Triumph, which is deſcribed in a lively manner by *Gregory Nazianzen*, who ſeemeth to have pleaſed himſelf with diſplaying, in that Deſcription, all the Eloquence he was Maſter of [g].

The Council of Alexandria.

The Biſhop of *Alexandria* being thus reinſtated, and again at full Liberty to exert his Zeal for the Catholic Cauſe, his firſt Care was to retrieve his fallen Brethren, and reunite them to the Church. With this View he aſſembled, in 362, a Council at *Alexandria*,

[e] Theod. l. 3. c. 2. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7. [f] Ammian. l. 22. p. 223, Soz. l. 4. c. 30. Philoſt. l. 7. c. 2. Epiph. p. 912. [g] Greg. Naz. 21.

andria, compoſed only of Confeſſors, that is, of ſuch Biſhops as had choſen rather to forfeit their Dignities and Sees, than receive or ſign the *Arian* Confeſſion of *Rimini* or *Sirmium*. This was one of the moſt reſpectable Councils that was ever held in the Church, not ſo much in regard of the Numbers (for I find not above Twenty named) as of the Merit, Virtue, and Sanctity of the Members that compoſed it. The chief Subject of their Debates, or rather Inquiries, was to find out the moſt proper Means of reſtoring Tranquillity to the Church, after ſo dreadful a Storm. Some, and among the reſt *Lucifer* Biſhop of *Cagliari*, who did not aſſiſt in Perſon, but by his Deputies, the Two Deacons *Herennius* and *Agapetus*, were for depoſing all thoſe who had ſigned theConfeſſion of *Rimini*, and cutting them off from the Communion of the Church. But this unſeaſonable Severity was condemned by the far greater Part, as tending to raiſe a new Storm, and involve the Church in greater Troubles than ever, which the Emperor *Julian* would take care to improve, to the total Ruin of the Chriſtian Religion. *Athanaſius* therefore was for uſing Severity only with the Authors, and chief Promoters, of the late general Defection: and his Opinion prevailed; for a Decree was enacted, importing, that the Authors of the late general Prevarication ſhould, even upon their Repentance, be received to the Communion of the Church only in the Capacity of Laymen, but that the reſt ſhould be all kept in, or reſtored to, their Sees, upon their publicly renouncing the *Arian* Communion, and embracing the Faith of *Nice* [h]. This Decree was every-where received with the greateſt Joy, the Biſhop of *Cagliari* being the only Man, either in the Eaſt or Weſt, who oppoſed it, and that with ſo much Obſtinacy, that, rather than yield, he choſe

A Schiſm formed by Lucifer, Biſhop of Cagliari.

[h] Ruf. l. 1. c. 28. Ath. ad Ruf. t. 2. p. 41. Amb. de ſalv. p. 316. Aug. ep. 50. Hier. in Lucif. c. 7.

choſe to ſeparate himſelf from the Communion of the reſt, and to form a new Schiſm, which bore his Name, and ſoon gained a conſiderable Footing, eſpecially in the Weſt; ſeveral Perſons no leſs diſtinguiſhed for Piety than Learning, and among the reſt *Gregory*, the famous Biſhop of *Elvira*, having adopted the Sentiments of a Man, who had ſuffered ſo much for the Purity of the Faith. As *Lucifer* is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint, and his Feſtival is kept on the 20th of *May* [i], *Baronius* pretends, that he abandoned his Schiſm, and returned to the Communion of the Church, before his Death [k]. But his Cotemporary *Ruffinus*, who probably knew him, aſſureth us, that he died in the Schiſm, which he had formed [l]. *Jerom* often ſpeaketh of his Schiſm, but no-where giveth us the leaſt Hint of his having ever quitted it; which would have afforded him a ſtrong Argument againſt the *Luciferians*, and he would not have failed to urge it, in the Book which he wrote to convince them of their Error. That Writer ſpeaketh of *Lucifer*, on all Occaſions, with the greateſt Reſpect, even in the Book which he wrote againſt his Followers: he owns, that his Intention was pure and upright; that it was not Pride, Thirſt after Glory, or a Deſire of tranſmitting his Name to Poſterity, but a miſtaken Zeal, that led him aſtray, and made him diſapprove what the others approved; he even diſtinguiſheth him with the Title of the *Bleſſed Lucifer* [m]. And hence *Baronius* concludes, that he returned to the Communion of the Church; for otherwiſe, ſays the Annaliſt [n], St. *Jerom* had never given him the Title of *Bleſſed*, or *Saint*. But that he did not return, is manifeſt, from the Silence of St. *Jerom* on that Head, and from the Authority of a cotemporary Writer quoted above: and hence I may draw a Concluſion far better grounded than that of *Baronius*; *viz.* that St. *Jerom* excuſed him

He never returned to the Communion of the Church.

[i] Bolland. Maii 20. p. 207. [k] Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132. [l] Ruf. l. 1. c. 30. [m] Hier. in Lucif. p. 144. [n] Bar. ad ann. 371. n. 132.

him on account of his good Intention; and, conſequently, that he did not hold the uncharitable Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, excluding from Salvation all who die out of her Communion, let their Intention be never ſo good. It is to be obſerved, that the *Luciferians* not only excluded from their Communion thoſe who had received the *Arian* Confeſſion, but all who communicated with them, even after they had anathematized that Confeſſion, and publicly embraced the Faith of *Nice*.

The Council of Alexandria ſaves the Church from Ruin.

The Reſolution, taken by the Confeſſors in the Council of *Alexandria*, is ſaid to have ſaved the Church from utter Ruin. For had that prevailed, which was urged with ſo much Warmth by *Lucifer*, the Biſhops, who had choſen rather to ſign the *Arian* Confeſſion than forfeit their Sees, would have kept them in Defiance of a Decree made by a ſmall Number of their Collegues, and in all Likelihood excommunicated and depoſed, in their Turn, thoſe who had excommunicated and depoſed them: and, in that Caſe, the *Arian* Party, comprehending almoſt all the Biſhops of the Church, muſt have prevailed. But as nothing was required of them, to keep their Sees, beſides their renouncing of the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, which they had embraced, and embracing that of *Nice*, which they had renounced, they readily complied with the Decree of the Council, inſomuch that the following Year 363, *Athanaſius*, in a Letter, which he wrote to the Emperor *Jovian*, immediately after the Death of *Julian*, could aſſure that Prince, that the Faith of *Nice* had been received, and was profeſſed, in all the Provinces of the Empire, which he enumerateth; but omits thoſe of *Thrace*, *Bithynia*, and the *Helleſpont* [o], the Biſhops there ſtill continuing obſtinately to maintain the Doctrine of *Arius*, and to reject the Faith of *Nice*, as we learn from *Sozomen* [p], *Socrates* [q], and *Baſil* [r]; nay, at *Conſtantinople*, the Orthodox

[o] Ath. ad Jov. t. 1. p. 246. [p] Soz. l. 6. c. 10. [q] Socr. l. 4. c. 1. [r] Baſ. ep. 75.

thodox had but a ſmall Chapel to aſſemble in, all the Churches being in Poſſeſſion of the *Arians*, under *Eudoxius*, a leading Man among the *Pure Arians*, who had uſurped that See[r]. For the better eſtabliſhing of the Orthodox Faith, after the violent Shock it had lately received, Councils were held in ſeveral Provinces of the Empire (A), and by all was received the Faith of *Nice*, the Confeſſion of *Rimini* condemned, and the Words *Subſtance* and *Conſubſtantial* re-eſtabliſhed[t]. A very ſtrong Proof, that the Aſſent given before to the *Arian* Doctrines had been ſolely the Effect of Force, or of Intereſt, which being

The Faith of Nice every-where eſtabliſhed.

[r] Socr. ib. [t] Ath. ad Afr. p. 931. & ad Epict. p. 582.

(A) The Biſhops of *Gaul* aſſembled at *Paris* in 362, and, having firſt owned their Crime, in approving and ſigning the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, they acknowleged the Three Perſons of the Trinity to be of the ſame Nature and Subſtance, and condemned *Urſacius*, *Valens*, and *Auxentius* the *Arian* Biſhop of *Milan*. This Council was convened by St. *Hilarius*, Biſhop of *Poictiers*; and a Letter, which the Council wrote on this Occaſion, hath been tranſmitted to us, among the Fragments of his Works. He is ſaid to have aſſembled ſeveral other Councils in *Gaul*, for the re-eſtabliſhing of the Faith of *Nice*, which is all we know of them. The ſame Year 362, the Biſhops of *Italy* aſſembling, declared void and null the Acts of the Council of *Rimini*, embraced the Faith of *Nice*, and, with one Accord, anathematized *Urſacius* and *Valens*, as the leading Men of the *Arian* Party. There is, among the Fragments of St. *Hilarius*, a Letter on this Subject, from the *Italian* to the *Illyrian* Biſhops. Where this Council was held I find no-where recorded. In the Year 363, the Emperor *Jovian* deſiring to be inſtructed in the Faith of the Catholic Church, by *Athanaſius* and the *Egyptian* Biſhops, who were come to wait on him, they aſſembled in Council, and agreed to propoſe no other Creed to him but that of *Nice*. At the ſame time they condemned the Hereſy of *Macedonius*, denying the Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt. This Council is generally thought to have been held at *Alexandria*. But, from the Letter, which they preſented to the Emperor, it appeareth to have conſiſted of ſome *Egyptian* Biſhops, who, as it is there ſaid, were appointed to repreſent all the others of the ſame Province (1). Had the Council been held at *Alexandria*, they had, I ſhould think, been all preſent. It muſt therefore have aſſembled in ſome Place out of *Egypt*; and where more likely

(1) Theod. l. 4. c. 3.

being now removed, and all left at Liberty to act as their Conſciences only directed, the Orthodox Faith prevailed as much as the other had done under *Conſtantius*.

As every one was allowed by *Julian* to believe what he pleaſed, and to own his Belief, whatever it was, the *Semi-Arians* convened a Council, ſoon after the Death of *Conſtantius*, who, in the Latter-end of his Life, had begun to perſecute them as much as he had favoured them before. This Council was compoſed of thoſe chiefly who had aſſiſted at that of *Seleucia*, of which I have ſpoken above; and they all agreed to condemn and anathematize the Doctrine of the *Pure Arians*, with the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, and

A Council convened by the Semi-Arians.

likely than at *Antioch*? For there the Emperor was this very Year, and there *Athanaſius* waited on him. The ſame Year another Council was held at *Antioch*, under *Melecius* Biſhop of that City. In that Council *Acacius*, Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Palæſtine*, who had been at the Head of the *Arian* Party, in the Latter-end of the Reign of *Conſtantius*, and his Followers, commonly ſtyled *Acacians*, embraced the Faith of *Nice*, and admitted the Term *Conſubſtantial*. *Acacius* had no other Faith but that of the Party which prevailed. Hence, in the Time of *Jovian*, who favoured the Orthodox Party, he profeſſed the Faith of *Nice*; but Two Years after he had ſigned it, he joined the *Arians* anew, ſeeing them in great Favour with the Emperor *Valens*. Several other Councils were held, from the Year 363, to 368, of which we have no particular Account. For *Athanaſius* telleth us, in general Terms, that many Councils aſſembled in *France*, in *Spain*, at *Rome*, in *Dalmatia*, in *Dardania*, in *Macedonia*, in *Epirus*, in *Greece*, in *Candia*, and the other Iſlands, in *Sicily*, in *Cyprus*, in *Lycia*, in *Iſauria*, in *Egypt*, and in *Arabia*; and that they all met to maintain the Orthodox Faith, the Faith of the Council of *Nice* (2). In his Letter to the Emperor *Jovian* he aſſureth him, that the Symbol of *Nice* was received in the above-mentioned Provinces, and, beſides, in *Britain*, in *Africa*, in *Pamphylia*, in *Libya*, in *Pontus*, in *Cappadocia*, and in the Eaſt, that is, in the Patriarchate of *Antioch* (3). But in the Provinces of *Thrace*, of *Bithynia*, and the *Helleſpont*, the *Semi-Arians* prevailed, until they were overpowered by the *Arians*, ſtrongly ſupported by the Emperor *Valens*, a moſt zealous Defender of *Arianiſm*.

(2) Athan: de Afr. & ad Epict. (3) Id. ad Jov.

and to sign anew the Confession of *Antioch*, establishing a Likeness in Substance between the Son and the Father. Thus they pretended to keep a due Mean between the Two opposite Extremes, of the Western Bishops, whose *Consubstantiality*, they said, left no room for the Distinction of Persons; and of the *Pure Arians*, who denied all Likeness [u]. It was after this Council that the *Semi-Arians*, separating themselves from the Communion of the *Pure Arians*, began to form a distinct Sect, and to be called *Macedonians*; which Name was given them from *Macedonius*, late Bishop of *Constantinople*, but deposed by the *Pure Arians*, in the Council they held in that City in 360, to make room for their great Champion *Eudoxius*, translated formerly from *Germanicia* to *Antioch*, and now from *Antioch* to *Constantinople*. They were also named *Marathonians*, from *Marathonius*, Bishop of *Nicomedia*, who, together with *Macedonius*, was at the Head of the Party; and *Pneumætomics*, that is, Enemies to the Holy Ghost, whose Divinity they denied, which was their chief, if not their only Error; for some are of Opinion, that although they rejected the Word *Consubstantial*, yet they agreed with the Orthodox in the Meaning of it. They led very regular, austere, and edifying Lives; and are, on that Score, highly commended and extolled by *Gregory Nazianzen* [w]. No Wonder therefore, that they soon spread all over the East, and gained every-where great Numbers of Followers. At *Constantinople*, and in the neighbouring Cities and Provinces, they were followed not only by the greater Part of the People, but by some Persons of Distinction, by such as were most remarkable for their Piety, by intire Monasteries, both of Men and Women [x]. The Inhabitants of *Cyzicus* in the *Propontis* were almost all of this Sect; and we are told of some Miracles wrought by a *Macedonian* of that Place [y], which

The Sect of the Macedonians.

[u] Soz. l. 5. c. 14. [w] Greg. Naz. orat. 44. [x] Ruf. l. c. 25.
[y] Socr. l. 2. c. 45. l. 4. c. 4. l. 5. c. 8.

which *Baronius* will not allow, although as well atteſted as any he relateth.

The Emperor *Valens*, who reigned in the Eaſt, which had been yielded to him by his Brother *Valentinian*, when he took him for his Collegue in the Empire, ſpared no Pains to reconcile this Sect with that of the *Arians*, which he greatly favoured. But, finding them no leſs averſe to the *Arians* than the Orthodox themſelves, he began in the Year 366, to perſecute them with great Cruelty. To avoid this Perſecution they reſolved to recur to the Emperor *Valentinian*, and, embracing the Faith profeſſed by him and the Weſtern Biſhops, to put themſelves under his Protection. Accordingly they diſpatched Three of their Body, *viz.* *Euſtathius* Biſhop of *Sebaſte*, *Sylvanus* of *Tarſus*, and *Theophilus* of *Caſtabala*, to acquaint the Emperor, in the Name of the reſt, with the Reſolution they had taken, and implore his Protection [z]. Theſe, being informed, on their Arrival in *Italy*, that *Valentinian* was waging War with the Barbarians on the Borders of *Gaul*, inſtead of repairing to him, which they apprehended might be attended with no ſmall Danger, went ſtrait to *Rome*, and there delivered to *Liberius* Letters from their Brethren, directed to him, and to the other Biſhops of the Weſt, whom they earneſtly intreated to uſe their Intereſt with the Emperor, in their Behalf, aſſuring them, that they ſincerely renounced the Errors they had hitherto held, and embraced the Catholic Faith, as explained and defined by the Council of *Nice* [a]. But *Liberius*, notwithſtanding theſe Aſſurances, ſuſpected their Sincerity; and therefore could not, by any means, be prevailed upon to communicate with them, or even to hear them, until they had delivered to him a Confeſſion of Faith, under their Hand, and in the Name of the whole Party, wherein they anathematized thoſe of *Rimini*, and *Nice* in *Bithynia*; condemned the Hereſy of *Arius*, with

They are perſecuted by the Emperor Valens.

Deliver to Liberius *their Confeſſion of Faith*;

[z] Id. l. 4. c. 12. Soz. l. 6. c. 10. [a] Soz. Socr. ib.

with all other Heresies; and received the Definitions of the Council of *Nice*, those particularly that related to *Consubstantiality*. To this Confession they added a solemn Protestation, declaring themselves ready to submit to the Sentence of such Judges as the Pope should think fit to appoint, should they, or those by whom they had been sent, be ever for the future accused or suspected of swerving in the least from the Faith they now embraced and professed [b]. In virtue of this Confession, whereof the Original was carefully lodged in the Archives of the Church of *Rome*, *Liberius* admitted the Deputies to his Communion; and, upon their Departure, wrote, in the Name of all the Bishops of *Italy*, and the West, to the *Macedonian* Bishops, of whom he nameth 59, signifying the great Joy, which their Letters, and the Confession of Faith, signed by their Deputies, had occasioned at *Rome*, and in all the Western Churches, since by such a Confession they were all again happily united in one Faith. In this Letter *Liberius* assures them, that all the Bishops, who had assisted at the Council of *Rimini*, had retracted the Doctrine, which they had been forced to sign there; and were more than ever incensed against the *Arians*, on account of the Violence, which, at their Instigation, had been offered them [c]. The *Macedonians* admitted the Divinity of the Son, but denied that of the Holy Ghost; nay, this was their favourite Doctrine, and, as it were, the Characteristic of their Sect; but *Liberius*, and the other Western Bishops, not suspecting them of such an Error, which in all Likelihood they had not yet publickly owned, admitted them to their Communion, without examining them on that Head.

who admits them to his Communion.

Liberius *dies.* *Liberius* died soon after, that is, on the 23d or 24th of *September*, of the present Year 366, as we are told by *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, whose Authority is preferable to that of any other, since, at this very

[b] Socr. ib. [c] Socr. l. 4. c. 12. Basil. ep. 82.

very time, they lived at *Rome*[d]. He had been chosen on the 22d of *May* 352, so that he governed the Church of *Rome* Fourteen Years, Four Months, and a Day or Two. *Liberius* lived in troublesome Times, the worst the Church had ever yet seen. She had Two dangerous Enemies to contend with at the same Time, the Power of the Prince then on the Imperial Throne, and the Craft of a most subtle and deceitful Party. The Prince employed all his Power to overcome, with Oppression, those whom the Party could not over-reach with their Craft; and the Party to over-reach, with their Craft, such as the Prince could not overcome with Oppression. On the other hand, the Prelates, even some who were reputed the Pillars of the Church, seemed to have lost that Zeal, Firmness, and Intrepidity, which they had so gloriously exerted under the Pagan Princes, and few were found among them, whose Virtue was proof against the Loss of their Dignity, or Exile. Hence the Defection became general, and the Orthodox Party was brought so low, that it must have been utterly quashed, had *Constantius* lived a few Years longer. But Providence interposed; *Constantius* died while he was pursuing his Scheme with the greatest Success; and *Julian*, his Successor, by betraying an equal Hatred and Aversion to Christians of all Denominations, obliged them to forget their Quarrels among themselves, to lay aside their Animosity against each other, and to unite in their mutual Defence against him, as a common Enemy. *Jovian*, who succeeded him, proved no less favourable to the Orthodox, than *Constantius* had been to the *Arians*. Many therefore of the latter, and among the rest *Acacius*, who was at the Head of the *Pure Arians*, to gain the Favour of the Emperor, publicly renounced the Doctrine of *Arius*, and embraced that of *Nice*. *Jovian*, after a short Reign of Seven Months and Twenty Days, was

The deplorable Condition of the Church in his Time.

[d] Marcell. & Faust. p. 4, 5.

was ſucceeded by *Valentinian*, who continued to countenance the Orthodox, as his Predeceſſor had done, although he did not uſe the *Arians* with that Rigour which ſome Zealots expected from a Confeſſor, which Title he had deſerved under *Julian*. However, as he profeſſed the Orthodox Faith, that Party univerſally prevailed; inſomuch that, in a very ſhort time, no Traces of *Arianiſm* were left in the Weſt, except at *Milan*, under the *Arian* Biſhop *Auxentius*, and in a few Cities of *Illyricum*, where it was kept up by *Urſacius*, *Valens*, *Germinius*, and their Diſciples, until the following Century, when it was every-where reeſtabliſhed there by the *Goths*.

By whom Arianiſm was baniſhed out of the Weſt.

Baronius aſcribeth to *Liberius* the baniſhing of *Arianiſm* out of the Weſt, and the eſtabliſhing of the Orthodox Faith in its room; but that Glory was oweing, according to *Ruffinus*, to *Hilarius* of *Poitiers*, and *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, who, like the Two great Luminaries of the Univerſe, to uſe his Words, enlightened with their Rays *Illyricum*, *Gaul*, and *Italy*, diſpelling every-where the Darkneſs of Hereſy [e]. He minutely deſcribes the great Succeſs that attended them, with the Difficulties and Obſtructions they met with in ſo pious and commendable an Undertaking [f]. But, as for *Liberius*, he doth not ſo much as mention him. And truly, from the Year 357, in which he fell, to his admitting the *Macedonians* to his Communion in 366, which was the laſt of his Life, the only thing I find recorded of him in the Antients is his writing a Letter to the Catholic Biſhops of *Italy*, wherein he exhorts them to atone for their paſt Conduct by renouncing the Errors of the *Arians*, and receiving anew the Symbol of *Nice*. He adds, that as this is the only Atonement, which it hath been thought proper to require of them, they ought to exert their Zeal againſt the Authors of the Fault they committed, in proportion to the Grief they muſt feel for committing it [g]. This Letter hath been tranſmitted

[e] Ruf. l. 1. c. 30, 31. [f] Idem ib. [g] Hill. frag. 1. p. 37, 38.

mitted to us among the Fragments of *Hilarius*. It is hard to gueſs what could induce *Baronius* to write ſo confidently as he does, that *Vincentius* of *Capua* aſſiſted at the Council of *Rimini* with the Character of the Pope's Legate [h]. In what antient Author did he find the leaſt Intimation or diſtant Hint of ſuch a Legation? *Vincentius* of *Capua*, although a Perſon of great Eminency, is not even mentioned by any of the cotemporary Writers, who relate the Tranſactions of that Council, and name the chief Prelates who compoſed it. It is true we read of him, in one Author, that he never conſented to the Confeſſion of *Rimini* [i]: but that is ſaid of *Liberius* too [k], whom *Baronius* owneth not to have been preſent at that Aſſembly.

Neither Vincentius of Capua, nor Liberius, aſſiſted at the Council of Rimini.

Liberius, notwithſtanding his Fall, is honoured both by the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches as a Saint. By the former his Feſtival is kept on the 23d of *September*, and by the latter on the 27th of *Auguſt* [l]. He erected a Church on the *Eſquiline* Mount at *Rome*, which bore his Name, and was called the *Baſilic of* Liberius, until it was conſecrated to the Virgin *Mary* by *Sixtus* III. when it took the Name of *Sancta Maria Major*, or *Saint Mary the Greater*. It oweth its Foundation, as is univerſally believed in the Church of *Rome*, to the following Miracle. A *Roman* of the *Patrician* Order, and of Wealth equal to his Rank, named *John*, having no Children, reſolved to make a free Gift of his whole Eſtate to the Virgin *Mary*. This Reſolution he imparted to his Wife, who conſenting to it with great Alacrity, the Eſtate was immediately made over to the holy Virgin, whom they thenceforth jointly intreated, in their daily Prayers, to let them know by ſome Token in what Manner ſhe choſe to diſpoſe of it. Their Prayers were heard, and, on the Night preceding the 5th of *Auguſt*, when the Heat is moſt violent at *Rome*,

Liberius is honoured as a Saint.

The Foundling of the Church of St. Mary the Greater.

[h] Bar. ad ann. 359. n. 3. [i] Theoph. l. 2. c. 13. [k] Id. ib.
[l] Menæa. p. 293.

Rome, a miraculous Snow fell from Heaven, which covered Part of the *Eſquiline* Mount. The ſame Night the Patrician and his Wife were admoniſhed in a Dream to build a Church on the Spot of Ground which they ſhould find covered with Snow. Early next Morning they went to acquaint Pope *Liberius* with what had happened, whom they found to have had the ſame Dream; ſo that no room being now left to doubt of the Revelation, the Pope appointed a grand Proceſſion of the whole Clergy, in which he walked himſelf, attended by Crouds of People, to the abovementioned Mount; and there, having cauſed the Snow, which ſtill lay unmelted, to be removed, on the Spot, which it had covered, he laid the Foundation of that magnificent Baſilic, which was reared at the Expence of the Patrician, and is now known by the Name of *Saint Mary the Greater*, and *Saint Mary in the Snow* [m]. I ſhould not have thought ſuch an idle Tale worthy of a Place in a grave Hiſtory, were it not recorded in the moſt authentic Book the Church of *Rome* hath after the Scripture, the *Roman Breviary*, a Book approved and commended by the Council of *Trent*, and by the ſpecial Bulls of Three Popes, *Pius* V. *Clement* VIII. and *Urban* VIII. of whom the latter declareth every thing it containeth to be extracted from antient and approved Authors, and to be agreeable to Truth [n]. So that it would be leſs dangerous, at leaſt in *Italy*, to deny any Truth revealed in the Scripture, than to queſtion any Fable related in the *Breviary*. The Feaſt of *the Snow*, or *St. Mary in the Snow*, is kept annually at *Rome*, on the 5th of *Auguſt*, with the greateſt Solemnity. The College of Cardinals aſſiſts that Day at Divine Service in the Church of *Saint Mary the Greater*; and the Pope, if not indiſpoſed, or otherwiſe prevented, officiateth in Perſon: the *Primicerio*,

[m] Breviar. Rom. 5. Aug. [n] Vide Bull. Urb. VIII. Breviario præfix.

Primicerio, or Dean of that Church, reads the Account, which I have delivered above; and, that nothing may be wanting to complete the Farce, Numbers of Children are employed, during the Service, to drop Jeſſamins from the Gallery on the Congregation, in Remembrance and Imitation of the miraculous Snow. And truly by Children alone ſuch Fables are proper to be acted and believed.

The Writings of Liberius.

Several Pieces have reached our Times, which were either written by, or have been falſly aſcribed to, *Liberius*. Among the former are, his Letter in Anſwer to the *Macedonian* Biſhops; another to the Catholic Biſhops of *Italy*; which have been both mentioned above; and a Diſcourſe, which he pronounced on *Chriſtmas-day* in the Church of St. *Peter*, on Occaſion of his giving the ſacred Veil to *Marcellina* the Siſter of St. *Ambroſe*, when ſhe embraced the State of Virginity. This Diſcourſe St. *Ambroſe* hath inſerted in his Third Book on Virgins, but in his own Style, which is very different from that of *Liberius*, who had not the Gift of Eloquence[o]. Among the Pieces falſly aſcribed to *Liberius*, moſt Men of Learning reckon the Confeſſion of Faith, written in *Greek*, which he is ſuppoſed to have ſent to *Athanaſius*. This Piece *Baronius* will, by all means, have to be genuine; and the Uſe he maketh of it is ſomewhat extraordinary. The Council of *Alexandria*, to which the Church owed her Safety, was convened by *Athanaſius*, upon his Return from Exile, as I have related above. By that ſmall Aſſembly, conſiſting only of Confeſſors, was enacted the famous Decree with reſpect to thoſe, who had communicated with the *Arians*, and ſigned the Confeſſion of *Rimini*. To that Decree the whole Church readily conformed; ſo that the Honour of ſaving the Church was chiefly owing to *Athanaſius*, and wholly to him and the other Confeſſors. Of *Liberius* not the leaſt Mention is made; ſo that he had no Share in that Glory. The

Writings falſly aſcribed to him.

[o] Amb. de virg. l 3. p. 437.

Strange Conjectures of Baronius.

Annalist therefore, not being able to bring in his Sovereign Pontiff upon the Authority of any Records now extant, hath recourse to those that probably never were; or, if they ever were, are now no more. He supposeth Part of the above-mentioned Confession of Faith, sent by *Liberius* to *Athanasius*, to be wanting; and *Liberius*, in the Part that is wanting, to have impowered *Athanasius* to convene a Council, and to have appointed *Eusebius* of *Vercelli*, and *Lucifer* of *Cagliari*, to assist at that Council with the Character of his Legates. Such wild and extravagant Suppositions require a very strong Proof to support them, some plausible Conjectures at least to give them an Appearance of Truth. But that we must not expect of *Baronius*. The only Argument, if it may be so called, which he pretendeth to offer on this Occasion, is, that he cannot conceive *Athanasius*, and the other holy Confessors, would have taken upon them to act as they did, and enact a Decree extending to the whole Church, had they not received such a Power from him, to whom all Power was given [p], meaning the Pope. The other Pieces, falsly ascribed to *Liberius*, are another Letter to *Athanasius*, and one to all the Catholic Bishops; which are both reputed supposititious, being dated by Consuls who never existed.

VALENTINIAN, VALENS, **DAMASUS**, GRATIAN, THEODOSIUS.

Thirty-sixth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 366.

Damasus a Native of Rome.

LIBERIUS was succeeded by *Damasus*, whom the *Spanish* Writers, upon the Authority of *Anastasius*, suppose to have been a Native of *Spain* [q]; though there is no room to doubt of his being born in *Rome*, since it appeareth from an Inscription quoted

[p] Bar. ad ann. 362. n. 206. [q] Anast. c. 38.

quoted by *Baronius*[r], that his Father had been Lector, Deacon, and Preſbyter, of the Church of St. *Laurence* in that City, and conſequently muſt have lived there from his Youth. *Damaſus* had a Siſter, named *Irene*, who embraced the State of Virginity, and died before ſhe was Twenty, as we read in her Epitaph[s]. It is not therefore probable that her Death happened in the Twelfth Year of her Brother's Pontificate, as the *Spaniſh* Author of her Life telleth us, he being then Seventy. *Damaſus* ſerved, as his Father had done, the Church of St. *Laurence*, till he was ſtricken in Years; for he was upwards of Sixty when raiſed to the Epiſcopal Dignity. He was Deacon of *Rome* in 355, when *Liberius* was ſent into Exile; on which Occaſion he not only bound himſelf, with the reſt of the Clergy, by a ſolemn Oath not to acknowlege any other Biſhop ſo long as *Liberius* lived, but attended him on his Journey to the Place of his Baniſhment[t]. *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus* ſeem to inſinuate, that ſoon afterwards, giving way to his Ambition, he forgot the Oath he had taken, abandoned *Liberius*, for whom he had profeſſed the greateſt Friendſhip, and ſided with *Felix* his Antagoniſt[u]. But theſe Two Preſbyters were zealous Partiſans of the Antipope *Urſinus*, of whom hereafter; and therefore we ought to be very cautious of what they write to the Prejudice of *Damaſus*. *Jerom*, who lived then at *Rome*, and in great Intimacy with *Damaſus*, reproacheth ſuch of the Eccleſiaſtics as forſook *Liberius*, and joined *Felix*, with the Breach of a moſt ſolemn Oath; ſtyles them Perjurers, Deſerters, Time-ſervers, *&c.* which I cannot think he would have done ſo freely, had *Damaſus* been one of the Number. I am therefore not a little ſurpriſed, that *Baronius* ſhould blindly acquieſce to the Accounts of the above-mentioned Writers,

and Deacon of that Church.

Whether he abandoned Liberius, and ſided with Felix.

[r] Baron. 384. 16. in appar. ad annal. [s] Bolland. 21 Feb. p. 244. [t] Marcell. & Fauſt. p. 3. [u] Idem p. 3--5.

Writers, and, without further Enquiry, condemn *Damasus* as guilty of Perjury, by ranking him among the Followers of *Felix* [w]. And yet the Annalist supposeth him to have been appointed Great Vicar of *Rome* by *Liberius*, upon his withdrawing from the City to avoid the Persecution raised by *Constantius* after the Council of *Rimini* [x]: so that, according to him, he must have changed Sides anew, and, abandoning *Felix*, returned to *Liberius*, which is representing him as a Man swayed by no other Principles but those of Interest and Ambition, and therefore always siding with those who were uppermost. This is all we know of *Damasus* before his Election.

He is chosen Bishop of Rome, *and likewise* Ursinus.

Liberius dying on the 23d or 24th of *September* 366, as I have related above, great Disturbances were raised in *Rome* by the Election of Two Bishops to succeed him, *viz.* *Damasus* and *Ursinus*, whom the later Writers style *Ursicinus*, a Deacon of that Church. This double Election gave Rise to a dangerous Schism, and a kind of Civil War, within the Walls of the City, which did not end without a great deal of Bloodshed. I shall impartially relate what I find concerning this important Transaction in the cotemporary Writers of either Side, leaving the Reader to judge which of the Two Pretenders was the Cause of so much Mischief, and which legally chosen. I shall begin with the Account which *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, who were then at *Rome*, give us of these Elections. They were both Presbyters of that Church, but, being strict Followers of *Lucifer* Bishop of *Cagliari*, of whom I have spoken above, they and their whole Party were deemed Schismatics, and consequently cruelly persecuted by the Catholic Bishops, especially *Damasus*. Finding themselves thus oppressed, the Two Presbyters, between 383 and 388, drew up a Petition in Behalf of themselves

[w] Bar. ad ann. 357. n. 60. & ad ann. 367. n. 8. [x] Idem ad ann. 359. n. 48.

ſelves and their afflicted Brethren, addreſſed to *Valentinian* II. *Theodoſius*, and *Arcadius*, intreating thoſe Princes to protect their Innocence, and put a Stop to the unbridled Rage of their Enemies. With this Requeſt the Two Preſbyters repaired to *Conſtantinople*, being driven from *Rome* by *Damaſus*, and there preſented it to *Theodoſius*, who, pitying their Condition, in his Reſcript directed to *Cynegius* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, treated them as Catholics, granted them the free Exerciſe of their Religion, and declared all thoſe wicked Men, nay, and Heretics, who had preſumed, or ſhould for the future preſume, to perſecute or moleſt them [y]. In the Preface, prefixed to this Petition, I find the following Account of both the above-mentioned Elections. *Urſinus*, ſay they, was choſen in the Baſilic of *Julius* by the Deacons *Amantius* and *Lupus*, and the People, who had continued in the Communion of *Liberius*; but *Damaſus*, by thoſe who had adhered to *Felix*, aſſembled for that Purpoſe in the Church of St. *Laurence*, called in *Lucinis*. *Urſinus* was ordained the firſt, by *Paul* Biſhop of *Tivoli*; which *Damaſus*, who had always panted after the Epiſcopal Dignity, no ſooner knew, than he hired a great Number of Chariot-drivers, and other ſuch deſpicable Wretches, who, violently breaking into the Baſilic of *Julius*, maſſacred a great many People there. Seven Days afterwards they made themſelves Maſters of the *Lateran* Baſilic, and there was *Damaſus* ordained Biſhop [z]. This Account chargeth *Damaſus* alone with the Schiſm, and the Evils attending it. On the other hand, the Council of *Rome*, held about Twelve Years after, lays the whole Blame on *Urſinus*, who, ſay they, boldly attempted to uſurp a Dignity, which on no Score was due to him [a]; and that which met at *Aquileia* in 381, and conſiſted of all the moſt eminent Biſhops of the Weſt,

Different Accounts of theſe Elections.

[y] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 18, 100, 103. Gennad. c. 16. [z] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 5, 6. [a] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 8.

West, ascribeth to *Ursinus*, and his Temerity, the many Calamities the Church had suffered; painteth him as a Man of no Credit, Character, or Reputation; and adds, that he seized by Force, what he had no Hopes of attaining by lawful Means [b]. *Ambrose* writes, that the Suffrage of Heaven concurred in the Election of *Damasus* [c]. According to these Authorities *Damasus* was lawfully elected, and *Ursinus* unlawfully. As to the Particulars of his Election, *Jerom*, who perhaps was then at *Rome*, telleth us, that *Damasus* was first chosen, and then *Ursinus*, who, after his Election, seized by Force on the Basilic of *Sicinus* [d], that is, according to the most probable Opinion, the Basilic of *Liberius*, now *Saint Mary the Greater*. *Socrates* says, that *Ursinus* having near as many Votes as *Damasus*, he was thereby encouraged to hold separate Assemblies, and to get himself ordained in a dark and retired Corner of the Basilic of *Sicinus* [e]. *Ruffinus* assureth us, that *Damasus* was already ordained, when *Ursinus*, transported with Rage at his being preferred to him, assembled a great Number of seditious People, and, supported by them, caused himself, in Defiance of the Canons of the Church, to be ordained, in the Basilic of *Sicinus*, by *Paul* Bishop of *Tivoli*; whereas the Bishops of *Rome* were always ordained and consecrated by those of *Ostia*. After his Consecration, continues this Author, he ordained several Persons; which was adding a Sacrilege to his unlawful Election [f]. Both *Ruffinus*, and *Socrates*, who followeth him, were certainly mistaken as to the Place of this Ordination, since we are told by *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, that *Ursinus* was ordained, not in the Basilic of *Sicinus*, but in that of *Julius* [g]. These Two Writers, who were in *Rome* at the Time of the Elections, tell us, in express Terms, that *Ursinus* was chosen before *Damasus*;

[b] Ibid. p. 68, 69, 71. [c] Amb. ep. 11. tom. 5. [d] Hieron. chron. [e] Socr. l. 4. c. 24. [f] Ruff. l. 2. c. 19. [g] Marc. & Faust. p. 5, 6.

ſus; and *Jerom*, who was probably in *Rome* at the ſame time, aſſureth us, in Terms no leſs expreſs, that *Damaſus* was choſen before *Urſinus*. The former were greatly addicted to *Urſinus*, and the latter no leſs attached to *Damaſus*. As for the Two Councils, which I have quoted above, they were held ſome Years after, when the Party of *Damaſus* had univerſally prevailed; and it was a Crime to acknowlege *Urſinus*. *Jerom* hath been followed by moſt of the Writers who came after, and the Authority of the other Two quite diſregarded, for no other Reaſon but becauſe they were Schiſmatics; for they joined *Lucifer*, as I have obſerved above, and refuſed to communicate with the Biſhops who had ſigned the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, nay, and with thoſe who communicated with them.

Great Diſturbances in Rome, *occaſioned by this double Election.*

By this double Election the Citizens of *Rome* ſaw themſelves, before they were aware, involved in a Civil War. The whole People were divided, ſome ſiding with *Damaſus*, and ſome with *Urſinus*; and neither of the Competitors ſhewed the leaſt Inclination to yield to the other. No Day paſſed without Skirmiſhes and Bloodſhed; inſomuch that *Juventius* Governor of the City, and *Julian* the *Præfectus Annonæ*, to put a Stop to the preſent, and prevent greater Diſturbances, agreed to baniſh *Urſinus*, whoſe Party ſeemed leſs powerful, together with his Two Deacons *Amantius* and *Lupus*. The Two Authors I have often quoted write, that both *Juventius* and *Julian* were bribed by *Damaſus*, who, taking Advantage of the Abſence of his Competitor, armed his Followers with Clubs and Swords, hoping thus to intimidate the Friends of the exiled Biſhop, and bring them in the End to acknowlege him. Seven Preſbyters of the Party of *Urſinus* were ſeized, at the Requeſt of *Damaſus*, in order to be ſent into Exile, but reſcued by the People of the ſame Party, and carried in Triumph to the Baſilic of *Liberius*; which *Damaſus* no ſooner heard, than, arming all his Followers,

lowers, both Clergy and Laymen, with Clubs, Swords, Axes, *&c.* he marched at the Head of the seditious and enraged Multitude to the Basilic, which he and his Partisans immediately invested, and attacked with the utmost Fury. It was set on Fire in several Places; the Doors were forced, the Roof uncovered, and thence Showers of Tiles discharged on the People assembled there; great was the Massacre; One hundred and Sixty Persons, Men and Women, were inhumanly murdered on the Side of *Ursinus*, and a great many more wounded, some of whom died of their Wounds. On the Side of *Damasus* not one single Person was killed. This Riot began on the 25th of *October* 366, at Eight in the Morning.

Several Persons massacred.

Thus the above-mentioned Writer [h]. *Ruffinus* writeth in general Terms, that the illegal Election of *Ursinus*, in Opposition to *Damasus*, occasioned such a Tumult, or rather Civil War among the People, some siding with the one, and some with the other, that the Places destined for Prayer streamed with Human Blood [i]. The Heathen *Ammianus Marcellinus* assureth us, that the Partisans of *Damasus* and *Ursinus* were so implacably incensed against each other, that several Persons were wounded in the Quarrel, and some killed: Nay, it is certain, addeth he, that in the Basilic of *Sicinus* One hundred and Thirty-seven Persons were found dead, all killed the same Day: but *Damasus* in the End, by the Efforts of his Party, got the better of his Antagonist [k]. *Jerom*, however partial, owns, that *Ursinus* having got Possession of the Basilic of *Sicinus*, the Partisans of *Damasus* repaired thither in Crouds, and that several Persons were thereupon inhumanly massacred [l]. The Sedition became general, and the Seditious on either Side so numerous and powerful, that *Juventius*,

The Sedition becometh general.

[h] Idem p. 6. 7. [i] Ruff. l. 2. c. 10. [k] Amm. Mar. l. 27. p. 337. [l] Hier. chron.

tius, not thinking it adviſable to puniſh, nor being able to appeaſe, the enraged Populace, abandoned the City, and retired to the Country [m]. He was perhaps for *Urſinus*, whoſe Party being over-matched by that of *Damaſus*, he might not think it ſafe to continue in *Rome*. Three Days after the Maſſacre in the Baſilic of *Liberius*, that is, on the 28th of *October*, the Partiſans of *Urſinus*, ſay *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus*, aſſembling, cried out aloud againſt *Damaſus*, complaining of his Conduct, and begging that a ſufficient Number of Biſhops might be convened, and the Controverſy referred to their Judgment and Deciſion [n]. *Damaſus* was greatly favoured, and chiefly ſupported, by the *Roman* Ladies, which probably gave Occaſion to the Charge of Adultery that was brought againſt him. But *Jerom*, either to clear him of this Charge, or to obviate the like Suſpicions, naturally ariſing from his familiar Converſation with the Female Sex, ſtyleth him a *Virgin Doctor of the Virgin Church* [o].

Baronius finding he can neither diſguiſe nor extenuate the Cruelties committed by thoſe who adhered to *Damaſus*, is at a great deal of Trouble to diſculpate him, and lay the whole Blame on *Maximinus*, who, as appeareth from Hiſtory, diſcharged the Office of *Præfectus Annonæ* from the latter End of the Year 367 to the Beginning of 370, and was noted for his Cruelty. *Baronius* is ſupported herein by the Authority of *Jerom* and *Ruffinus*, of whom the former writes, that *Damaſus* remained Conqueror, without hurting the Conquered [p]; and the latter, that the Cruelties practiſed by the Prefect *Maximinus*, who had eſpouſed the Cauſe of *Damaſus*, upon thoſe of the adverſe Party, rendered the Name of that virtuous Prelate odious, though he had no Share in them [q]. But who is to be charged with the Maſſacre

Damaſus not eaſily cleared from all Guilt.

[m] Ammian. ibid. [n] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 9. [o] Hier. ep. 5. t. 2. [p] Hier. ep. 49. [q] Ruff. l. 2. c. 20.

sacre in the Basilic of *Sicinus*, or *Liberius?* On whom are the Murders to be laid committed there? *Maximinus* was not then in Power, and perhaps not at *Rome*. I cannot help thinking but *Damasus* might at least have restrained his Followers from such Excesses; and consequently, as he did not, I cannot, with *Ruffinus*, conclude him to have had no Share in them; I say, *at least restrained*; for I will not charge him with heading and encouraging the riotous Multitude in that wicked Attempt, upon the bare Authority of *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, both zealous Partisans of *Ursinus*. But neither ought *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, *Davidius*, &c. upon the bare Testimony of Two Writers, no less sanguine in the Cause of *Damasus*, suppose him to have been noways concerned in those Disorders. The famous *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who lived at this very time in *Rome*, and, as a Pagan, was no ways concerned in the Quarrel, nor more inclined to one Side than the other, assureth us, that both were equally ambitious of the Episcopal Dignity, and both equally guilty[r]. The Authority of a Writer, thus unbiassed, and in every other respect unexceptionable, ought to be preferred, without the least Hesitation, to that of any other, whom we have just Reason to suspect of Partiality. *Jerom* indeed speaketh with more Modesty and Reserve than *Ruffinus*, and those who have copied after him; for he only says, that *Damasus* did not hurt his Enemies after he had conquered them. But, in relating the above-mentioned Massacre, and the Skirmishes that happened before the Party of *Damasus* prevailed, he always describeth his Partisans as the Aggressors, without ever pretending to excuse him, as having no Share in those Riots; which he would not have failed to do, had he not paid a greater Regard to Truth than *Ruffinus* seemeth to have done.

The

[r] Ammian. l. 27. p. 337.

The Heathen *Marcellinus*, after telling us, that *Damaſus* and *Urſinus* aſpired with equal Ambition to the Epiſcopal Chair, adds this famous Remark, which I ſhall ſet down in his own Words: *I muſt own*, ſaith he, *that when I reflect on the Pomp attending that Dignity, I do not at all wonder, that thoſe who are fond of Shew and Parade ſhould ſcold, quarrel, fight, and ſtrain every Nerve to attain it; ſince they are ſure, if they ſucceed, to be enriched with the Offerings of the Ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in ſtately Chariots, and gorgeouſly attired; to keep coſtly and ſumptuous Tables; nay, and to ſurpaſs the Emperors themſelves in the Splendor and Magnificence of their Entertainments. But how happy would they be, if, deſpiſing the Grandeur of the City, which they allege to excuſe their Luxury, they followed the Example of ſome Biſhops in the Provinces, who, by the Temperance and Frugality of their Diet, the Poverty and Plainneſs of their Dreſs, the Modeſty of their Looks fixed on the Ground, the Purity of their Lives, and the Regularity of their whole Conduct, approve themſelves to the eternal God and all his true Worſhippers*[s]*!* Thus *Ammianus*. And that *Damaſus* was fond of all that Pomp, Grandeur, and Parade, that he led ſuch a voluptuous Life, as *Ammianus* here ſo juſtly cenſureth and condemneth in the Biſhops of *Rome*, is not to be doubted, ſince *Prætextatus*, a Man of the firſt Quality, honoured with the greateſt Employments of the Empire, and zealouſly attached to Paganiſm, in converſing familiarly with him, uſed pleaſantly to ſay, *Make me Biſhop of* Rome, *and I will immediately turn Chriſtian*[t]. But, as I ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak of this Subject hereafter, I ſhall only obſerve here, that the Offerings of thoſe devout Women, and other pious Chriſtians, were no better employed in the Days of *Damaſus*, than the immenſe Wealth, which the Church of *Rome* acquired in After-ages, by the voluntary Contributions of all the Chriſtian Nations, is diſpoſed of in ours. With theſe

The Luxury of the Biſhops of Rome.

[s] Id. ib. p. 337, 338. [t] Hier. ep. 61. t. 2.

How the Oblations of the Faithful were disposed of.

these Offerings the Bishops of *Rome* used, in more early Times, to maintain the Poor of their own Church, and send the Overplus to other Churches, where the Poor were numerous, and the Offerings small. Of this generous Practice I have mentioned some Instances, that well deserve to be recorded. But when Ambition began to take place of Charity, the Poor were forgotten, and nothing thought of but splendid Equipages, numerous Retinues, princely Apparel, sumptuous Tables, and whatever else could feed the Vanity of these upstart Princes, and put them upon the Level with the greatest Monarchs. To such Purposes were the Oblations of the Faithful perverted. *Baronius* taketh it very much amiss of *Ammianus*, that he should find fault with the costly Tables and Entertainments of the Popes, since it is manifest from St. *Austin*, that the Christians at *Rome*, and, no doubt, the Pope with the rest, kept a rigorous Fast Three Days in the Week [u]; so that, in his Opinion, they ought not to be blamed for rioting Four Days in the Week, provided they fasted Three. But to this Doctrine *Ammianus* was a Stranger, and therefore, notwithstanding the Fasts they might keep, he justly censured their expensive Tables and Banquets, as noways suited to their Profession and Character.

Ursinus recalled by Valentinian;

But to return to *Ursinus*; he had been banished *Rome* by the Prefect *Juventius*, before the 26th of *October* 366, as I have related above; but the Emperor *Valentinian*, who was at this time in *Gaul*, having, at the Request of his Friends, granted him Leave to return, he entered the City on the 15th of *September* 367, in a kind of Triumph, being met and received with loud Acclamations by those of his Party [w]. At the same time the Emperor directed a Rescript to *Prætextatus*; who had succeeded *Juventius*

[u] August ep. 86. Baron. ann. 367. num. 10. [w] Marc. & Faust. p. 6—9.

tius in the Præfecture of *Rome*, injoining him to recal all those, who had been banished for the late Riots, and re-instate them in their former Condition, after warning them, that, if for the future, they disturbed the Peace of the Public, they should be punished without Mercy [x]. But, notwithstanding this Warning, new Disturbances must have happened, since *Ursinus* was, by an Order from the Emperor, banished again on the 16th of *November* of the same Year 367, together with Seven of his Followers, who were all confined to different Places in *Gaul*, where they continued till the Year 371 [y]. The Two Presbyters tell us, that *Damasus*, having, with large Sums, gained the Ministers and Favourites at Court, by their means extorted from the Emperor the above-mentioned Order. They add, that the Friends of *Ursinus* were resolved to stand by him; but that he, to prevent Bloodshed, delivered himself up into the Hands of the Officers of Justice [z]. However that be, by the Banishment of *Ursinus*, and some of the leading Men of his Party, Tranquillity was restored for a while, and the Disturbances composed, saith *Ammianus*, which the Christians had raised by quarrelling among themselves [a].

but banished anew.

About this Time the Emperor *Valentinian* enacted a Law, impowering the Bishop of *Rome* to examine and judge other Bishops, that religious and ecclesiastical Disputes might not be decided by profane or secular Judges, but by a *Pontiff of the same Religion, and his Collegues* [b]. A very imprudent Law, considering the Nature and Consequences of such a Concession. The Bishops assembled in Council at *Rome* in 378, after declaring in the strongest Terms, their Approbation of this Law, agreed to present an Address to the Emperor *Gratian*, wherein they earnestly recom-

The Bishop of Rome *impowered by the Emperor to judge other Bishops.*

[x] Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 4. [y] Marc. & Faust. p. 9. 10.
[z] Idem ibid. [a] Ammian. l. 27. p. 349. [b] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80.

How the Oblations of the Faithful were disposed of.

these Offerings the Bishops of *Rome* used, in more early Times, to maintain the Poor of their own Church, and send the Overplus to other Churches, where the Poor were numerous, and the Offerings small. Of this generous Practice I have mentioned some Instances, that well deserve to be recorded. But when Ambition began to take place of Charity, the Poor were forgotten, and nothing thought of but splendid Equipages, numerous Retinues, princely Apparel, sumptuous Tables, and whatever else could feed the Vanity of these upstart Princes, and put them upon the Level with the greatest Monarchs. To such Purposes were the Oblations of the Faithful perverted. *Baronius* taketh it very much amiss of *Ammianus*, that he should find fault with the costly Tables and Entertainments of the Popes, since it is manifest from St. *Austin*, that the Christians at *Rome*, and, no doubt, the Pope with the rest, kept a rigorous Fast Three Days in the Week [u]; so that, in his Opinion, they ought not to be blamed for rioting Four Days in the Week, provided they fasted Three. But to this Doctrine *Ammianus* was a Stranger, and therefore, notwithstanding the Fasts they might keep, he justly censured their expensive Tables and Banquets, as noways suited to their Profession and Character.

Ursinus *recalled by* Valentinian;

But to return to *Ursinus*; he had been banished *Rome* by the Prefect *Juventius*, before the 26th of *October* 366, as I have related above; but the Emperor *Valentinian*, who was at this time in *Gaul*, having, at the Request of his Friends, granted him Leave to return, he entered the City on the 15th of *September* 367, in a kind of Triumph, being met and received with loud Acclamations by those of his Party [w]. At the same time the Emperor directed a Rescript to *Prætextatus*; who had succeeded *Juventius*

[u] August ep. 86. Baron. ann. 367. num. 10. [w] Marc. & Faust. p. 6—9.

tius in the Præfecture of *Rome*, injoining him to recal all those, who had been banished for the late Riots, and re-instate them in their former Condition, after warning them, that, if for the future, they disturbed the Peace of the Public, they should be punished without Mercy [x]. But, notwithstanding this Warning, new Disturbances must have happened, since *Ursinus* was, by an Order from the Emperor, banished again on the 16th of *November* of the same Year 367, together with Seven of his Followers, who were all confined to different Places in *Gaul*, where they continued till the Year 371 [y]. The Two Presbyters tell us, that *Damasus*, having, with large Sums, gained the Ministers and Favourites at Court, by their means extorted from the Emperor the above-mentioned Order. They add, that the Friends of *Ursinus* were resolved to stand by him; but that he, to prevent Bloodshed, delivered himself up into the Hands of the Officers of Justice [z]. However that be, by the Banishment of *Ursinus*, and some of the leading Men of his Party, Tranquillity was restored for a while, and the Disturbances composed, saith *Ammianus*, which the Christians had raised by quarrelling among themselves [a].

but banished anew.

About this Time the Emperor *Valentinian* enacted a Law, impowering the Bishop of *Rome* to examine and judge other Bishops, that religious and ecclesiastical Disputes might not be decided by profane or secular Judges, but by a *Pontiff of the same Religion, and his Collegues* [b]. A very imprudent Law, considering the Nature and Consequences of such a Concession. The Bishops assembled in Council at *Rome* in 378, after declaring in the strongest Terms, their Approbation of this Law, agreed to present an Address to the Emperor *Gratian*, wherein they earnestly recom-

The Bishop of Rome *impowered by the Emperor to judge other Bishops.*

[x] Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 4. [y] Marc. & Faust. p. 9. 10. [z] Idem ibid. [a] Ammian. l. 27. p. 349. [b] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 80.

recommended to him the Execution of it, because it greatly redounded, say they, to the Honour of the sacred Ministry; because the Judgment of Bishops was more sure and certain than that of any Civil Magistrate; and lastly, because it delivered the Prelates of the Church from the just Concern they were under, to find that they could not make their Innocence appear without Racks and Tortures, which innocent Persons were put to by the secular Judges [c]. This Exemption seemeth to have been understood by the Council as extending to all Cases, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical. Be that as it will, whatever Exemption was by the above-mentioned Law granted to the Bishops, whatever Power was by that Law vested in the Bishop of *Rome*, and his Collegues, the Council, with a due Sense of Gratitude, acknowledged such Power and Immunity to be intirely owing to the Indulgence of the Emperor: a plain Proof that the absurd and chimerical Notion of a *Divine Right* was not yet broached. The Bishops chose rather to be judged by the Pope, and his Collegues, that is, by their own Brethren, than by Lay-Judges, for the Reasons they allege in their Address to *Gratian*. Hence they chearfully submitted to his Judgment, and applauded every new Power that was granted him, as redounding to the Honour of the Episcopal Order. But, alas! they were not aware, that every new Power, yielded to the Bishop of *Rome*, was a new Link added to the Chain, they were forging, if not for themselves, for those at least, who were to succeed them. They little apprehended, that the Bishop of *Rome* would, in Process of Time, claim all the Power vested in him, and his Collegues, as due to him alone, and that too by *Divine Right*; that, in virtue of such a Claim, he would set up for universal and sole Monarch of the Church, exercise an unbounded Authority and Jurisdiction, and degrade all other Bishops from his Collegues to his Vassals

[c] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 81.

Vaſſals and Slaves. *Blondel* is of Opinion, that the Biſhop of *Rome* was, by that Law, only impowered to judge the Biſhops within the Limits of his Juriſdiction, that is, thoſe of the Suburbicarian Provinces [d]. Others think, that ſuch a Power was only for a time, and extended to thoſe Biſhops alone who were concerned in the preſent Schiſm; which ſeemeth moſt probable, ſince *Valentinian* declares, that he enacted the above-mentioned Law to ſettle the Church, ſhaken by the Fury of the Schiſm [e].

The Followers of Urſinus driven out of Rome

Urſinus, and the leading Men of his Party, being driven out of the City, the Inhabitants began to enjoy their former Peace and Tranquillity. But yet his Followers continued to aſſemble in the Cœmeteries of the Martyrs, and even kept Poſſeſſion of a Church, ſuppoſed to be that of St. *Agnes*, without the Walls [f]. Of this *Damaſus* took care to tranſmit an Account to the Emperor, in a Memorial; who, fearing that from ſuch a Spark the Fire might break out again, which he had been ſtriving to extinguiſh, injoined *Prætextatus* to put *Damaſus* forthwith in Poſſeſſion of that Church; and, in the Execution of this Order, probably happened what we find related, perhaps with ſome Exaggeration, by the Two Writers I have often quoted; for they tell us, that one Day, while the Followers of *Urſinus* were aſſembled, in great Numbers, in the Church of St. *Agnes*, *Damaſus*, falling unexpectedly upon them with his Satellittes, made a dreadful Havock of the innocent and defenceleſs Multitude [g]. After this Second Maſſacre *Prætextatus*, to ſecure the Tranquillity of the City, ſent ſeveral more of the Party of *Urſinus* into Exile. *Valentinian*, however, would not conſent to their being confined to any particular Place; but gave them full Liberty to live where they

[d] Blond. Prim. p. 165. [e] Cod. Theodor. ap. pag. 30.
[f] Marcell. & Fauſtin. pag, 10. Baron. ad ann. 368. [g] Idem p. 10, 11.

they pleased, provided they kept out of *Rome*[h] The Two Writers add, that the Cruelties exercised in the Church of St. *Agnes* gave great Offence to the Bishops of *Italy*; and that *Damasus*, having invited some of them to *Rome*, to solemnize with him the Anniversary of his Consecration, he laid hold of that Opportunity to solicit them with Intreaties, nay, and to tempt them with Money, to condemn *Ursinus*; but all in vain; the Bishops, equally unmoved by his Prayers and Offers, refusing, with great Firmness and Resolution, to condemn a Man whom they had not heard. *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus* close their Preface with a short Account of themselves, telling us, that the Presbyters of *Ursinus*'s Party were imprisoned, racked, banished, dispersed, and sent into different Countries; and that they themselves, who were of that Number, presented a Petition to the Emperors, begging them to put a Stop to so cruel a Persecution[i].

Damasus *assembleth a Council at* Rome.

Damasus having thus, in the End, by the Favour of the Emperors, intirely got the better of the adverse Party, and secured his Dignity, he turned his Thoughts to Ecclesiastical Matters. In the West there were now but Three Bishops, who still maintained the Doctrine of *Arius*; *viz.* *Ursacius* Bishop of *Singidunum*, *Valens* of *Mursa*, and *Auxentius* of *Milan*. *Damasus*, however, convened a numerous Council at *Rome*; and there examined anew, and anew condemned, the Tenets of *Arius*, and all who held them, namely *Ursacius*, and *Valens*[k]. *Auxentius* was a pure, and no less zealous *Arian*, than either of these Two; but as he was in favour with *Valentinian*, whom he had deceived by an equivocal Confession of Faith, *Damasus*, and his Council thought it adviseable not to name him. The Council wrote a synodal Letter to the other Bishops, acquainting them with

Ursacius *and* Valens *condemned.*

Auxentius *why spared.*

[h] Vide Bar. ad ann. 368. n. 3. [i] Marc. & Faust, p. 11, 12.
[k] Athan. ad Afr. p. 931.

with what had paſſed; which was anſwered by *Athanaſius*, and the Biſhops of *Egypt*, then aſſembled at *Alexandria*. In their Anſwer they thank *Damaſus* for condemning *Urſacius* and *Valens*; but, at the ſame time, expreſs no ſmall Surprize, to find, that *Auxentius* was not yet depoſed, though guilty not only of *Arianiſm*, but of many other Crimes, which they enumerate [1]. *Damaſus* and his Collegues paid, no doubt, great Regard to the Remonſtrances of *Athanaſius*; but, as *Auxentius* was ſupported by the Emperor, and they were better Courtiers than *Athanaſius*, they never attempted to depoſe him; nay, they carried their Complaiſance ſo far as to condemn *Urſacius* and *Valens*, as if they had been the only *Arian* Biſhops in the Weſt, without ever naming *Auxentius*. He therefore kept, for many Years, quiet Poſſeſſion of the See he had uſurped, and was at laſt deprived of it by Death alone.

The Avarice of the Roman *Clergy reſtrained by* Valentinian.

The many Abuſes and Diſorders, that reigned at this time among the Eccleſiaſtics of *Rome*, offered a larger Field to the Zeal of *Damaſus*, than the Hereſy of *Arius*, now confined in the Weſt to a Corner of *Illyricum*. But he was by no means a fit Perſon to ſet up for a Reformer of Manners, and the Evil required a more powerful Remedy than he could apply. The Prelates of the Church, even the Biſhops of *Rome*, could yet only preach againſt Vice, admoniſh the Vicious, and inflict eccleſiaſtical Cenſures on ſuch as gave no Ear to their Admonitions: all other Power was ſtill lodged in Lay Hands, and only imparted to the Eccleſiaſtics in ſome extraordinary Caſes. The inſatiable Avarice of the *Roman* Clergy, the mean and ſcandalous Arts they were daily practiſing to circumvent the Orphans, plunder the Widows, and rob the lawful Heirs of their juſt Inheritance, cried loudly for a Reform; but were Evils too ſtrong for the Curb of Exhortation, Admonition, or Cenſures merely Eccleſiaſtical; and *Damaſus* himſelf

[1] Idem ib. p. 931--941.

was not quite free from Imputations of this Nature. It was therefore necessary, that the Secular Power should interpose in Defence of the deluded Laity, against the Craft and Rapines of the ravenous Clergy. A Law was accordingly enacted by the Emperor *Valentinian*, in the Year 370, addressed to *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, and read on the 29th of *July*, in all the Churches of that City, strictly forbidding the Ecclesiastics, and such of them as professed Celibacy meaning the Monks, to frequent the Houses of Orphans or Widows, or to accept from those, whom they attended under the Veil of Religion, any thing whatsoever by way of Donation, Legacy, or Feoffment in Trust. Whatever was thus given or accepted is declared forfeited to the Public Treasury [m].

Law enacted by him

This Law taken in a literal Sense, only forbids the Ecclesiastics to accept such Donations as were made by the Women whom they attended in spiritual Matters as their guides and Directors; but it was either understood and interpreted as extending to all Donations from pious Persons, or a new Law was made at this time excluding the Ecclesiastics from all such Donations, as plainly appeareth from *Jerom* and *Ambrose*, of whom the former, in one of his Letters writes thus: *I am ashamed to say it, the Priests of the Idols, the Stage-Players, Charioteers, Whores, are capable of inheriting Estates, and receiving Legacies; from this common Privilege, Clerks alone, and Monks, are debarred by Law; debarred, not under persecuting Tyrants, but Christian Princes* [n]. And *Ambrose*; *We are excluded by Laws, lately enacted, from all Inheritances, Donations, and Legacies; yet we do not complain: And why should we? By such Laws we only lose Wealth; and the Loss of Wealth is no Loss to us. Estates are lawfully bequeathed to the Ministers of the Heathen Temples; no layman is excluded, let his Condition*

The Sentiments of St. Jerom *and* Ambrose *concerning his Law.*

[m] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 2. l. 20. p. 48. [n] Hier. ep. 2. p. 13.

dition be ever ſo low, let his Life be ever ſo ſcandalous: Clerks alone are debared of a Right common to the reſt of Mankind. Let a Chriſtian Widow bequeath her whole Eſtate to a Pagan Prieſt, her Will is good in Law; let her bequeath the leaſt Share of it to a Miniſter of God, her Will is null. I do not mention theſe Things by Way of Complaint, but only to let the World know that I do not complain; for I had rather we ſhould want Money, than Virtue or Grace[o]. From theſe Teſtimonies it is manifeſt, that either by the above-mentioned Law, or by ſome other publiſhed at this Time, the Eccleſiaſtics were reſtrained from receiving any Donations or Legacies whatever, by whomſoever bequeathed; and that ſuch a Law was abſolutely neceſſary, is no leſs manifeſt from the unqueſtionable Authority of *Jerom*, who lived at this very Time in *Rome*, and deſcribeth as an Eye-witneſs the Arts that were practiſed with great Succeſs by the *Roman* Clergy to circumvent rich Widows, and old Men. *The Clerks*, ſaith he, *who ought to inſtruct and awe the Women with a grave and compoſed Behaviour, firſt kiſs their Heads, and then, ſtretching out their Hand as it were to beſtow a Bleſſing, ſlyly receive a Fee for their Salutation. The Women in the mean time, elated with Pride in ſeeing themſelves thus courted by the Clergy, prefer the Freedom of Widowhood to the Subjection attending the State of Matrimony. Some of the Clergy make it the whole Buſineſs and Employment of their Lives to learn the Names of the Ladies, to find out their Habitations, to ſtudy their Humour. One of theſe* (perhaps *Antimus* or *Sophronius*, two Monkiſh Harpyes, of whom he ſpeaketh elſewhere), *an Adept in the Art, riſeth with the Sun, ſettleth the Order of his Viſits, acquainteth himſelf with the ſhorteſt Ways, and almoſt breaketh into the Rooms of the Women before they are awake. If he ſeeth any curious Piece of Houſhold-Furniture, he extolleth, admireth, and handleth it; and ſighing that he too ſhould ſtand in need of ſuch Trifles, in the End, ra-*

o Amb. ep. 12. t. 5. p. 200.

ther extorteth it by Force, than obtaineth it by Good-will, the Ladies being afraid to disoblige the prating old Fellow, that is always running about from House to House [p]. The same Writer, speaking elsewhere of the Monks, displays the Arts which they practised to deceive, captivate, and plunder, the rich Widows, and old Men; and adds, that by professing Poverty, they were become rich, and that the Church grieved to see many acquire great Wealth by serving her, who had been Beggars, while they lived in the World [q]. So that the Monastic Profession was in those early Times what it is now, a gainful Trade, under the Mask of Religion. As for the mean, nay, and nauseous Offices, to which they were prompted by their Avarice, and the greedy expectation of Legacies, to submit, about the childless old Men and Women in their Sickness, it would be forgetting the Dignity of an Historian to mention them. The Reader will find them described by *Jerom*, and perhaps too minutely, in the Letter he wrote to his Friend *Nepotian* [r]. In the same Letter he informeth us, how the Wealth, thus acquired, was disposed of. *I*, saith he, applying to himself what he levelled at others, to render the Truth he spoke less disagreeable: *I, who was born in a poor Country-Cottage, who had scarce Millet enough, and coarse Bread, to satiate my craving Stomach, now despise the finest Flour, the choicest Honey, am well acquainted with the different Kinds and Names of Fishes, and can tell by the Taste from what Coast each Shell-fish was brought, from what Province each Bird* [s]. A Law was therefore necessary to restrain the insatiable Avarice of the *Roman* Clergy, and obviate the unhallowed Use they made of the Wealth, which by such scandalous Means they had acquired. This Law *Jerom* calleth a Caustic; and adds, that he doth not complain of it, but of the Sore that required it [t].

How-

[p] Hier. ep. 22. [q] Id. ep. 3. [r] Id. ep. 2. [s] Idem ibid. [t] Idem ibidem.

However, that he complaineth, and *Ambroſe* too, not only of the Sore, but the Cauſtic, is manifeſt from their Words, and Manner of writing. To exaggerate the pretended Hardſhip, they both obſerve, that the Pagan Prieſts lay under no ſuch Reſtraint: An unſeaſonable Obſervation! ſince it ſheweth the Difference between the Pagan and Chriſtian Prieſthood in a mortifying Light. The former gave no Occaſion to ſuch a Law, their Avarice wanted no ſuch Reſtraints; if it had, we may be ſure they had met with no Quarter from a Chriſtian, nay, from an orthodox Prince; and if he had ſpared them, ſuch Partiality had not been tamely put up, and paſſed over in Silence, by the Eccleſiaſtical Writers of thoſe Times, namely, by the Two I have mentioned.

Baronius is of Opinion, that the above-mentioned Law was procured by *Damaſus*, who, finding his Clergy no longer awed by the Spiritual Sword, had recourſe to the Temporal; for the Temporal addeth he, though in the Emperor's Hands, was given by our Saviour to St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors, as well as the Spiritual [v]. Thus he putteth at once both Swords into the Pope's Hands, though he hath not yet been able to allege one ſingle Inſtance of their having either. They got both, it is true, in After-ages; and we ſhall ſee, in the Sequel of this Hiſtory, how they came by them. But that Law, ſaith *Baronius*, was read in all the Churches of *Rome*. And ſo have others been, when they concerned the Clergy, and were addreſſed to, though not procured by, the Biſhop of that City [w]. Beſides, as *Damaſus* loved Pomp and Grandeur, it is not at all probable that he was inſtrumental in the enacting of a Law, which deprived him of the main Fund to ſupport them, the Generoſity of the *Roman* Ladies.

The Law probably not procured by Damaſus.

Two Years after, that is, in 372, the Law I have mentioned above was extended by the ſame Prince, *viz.*

It is extended to ſacred Virgins and to Biſhops.

[v] Baron. ad ann. 370. n. 118. [w] Vide Cod. Theod. tom. 6. pag. 50.

viz. Valentinian, to the sacred Virgins and Bishops, so as to exclude the former from the Right of giving, and the latter from that of receiving any thing whatsoever by way of Donation, Legacy, *&c*[x]. But this Law, with another still more severe, published Twenty Years afterwards by the Emperor *Theodosius*, was abrogated by the Emperor *Marcian*, in the Year 455, as I shall have Occasion to relate hereafter. In the mean time I cannot help observing with Astonishment, how early the primitive Rigour of Discipline and Manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the Ecclesiastics of *Rome*; how early the most exorbitant Luxury, with all the Vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian Arts of acquiring Wealth universally practised. They seem to have rivalled, in riotous living, the greatest Epicures of Pagan *Rome*, when Luxury was there at the highest Pitch. For *Jerom*, who was an Eye-witness of what he wrote, reproaches the *Roman* Clergy with the same Excesses, which the Poet *Juvenal* so severely censured in the *Roman* Nobility, under the Reign of *Domitian*. And how much more worthy were the former of the severest Censure, not only in regard of their Calling, and the Religion they professed, teaching them to curb and subdue all irregular Passions and Appetites, but from this aggravating Circumstance, that the Estates they so squandered and wasted were not their own, but the Patrimony of the Poor, the Substance of the Orphans, Widows, and unhappy Persons, whom, under the Cloke of Religion, they robbed of their just Inheritance! And herein they conformed to the Example of their Chief, who, finding an inexhaustible Fund in the Generosity of the *Roman* Ladies to support his Extravagance, lived in that Pomp and Grandeur which *Ammianus* hath described above.

The primitive Rigour and Discipline utterly neglected at Rome.

But he was roused from the easy and indolent Life he led at *Rome*, by Letters from the famous *Basil*, lately

The Orthodox persecuted in the East.

[x] Cod. Theod. mov. 16. t. 2. l. 22. p. 50.

lately raiſed to the See of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, the Metropolis of *Pontus*, imploring his Aſſiſtance, and that of the other Weſtern Biſhops, in the preſent unhappy Condition of the Churches in the Eaſt. *Arianiſm* was almoſt utterly extirpated in the Weſt under the orthodox Emperor *Valentinian*, as I have obſerved above; but in the Eaſt it triumphed under his Brother *Valens*, a moſt zealous Favourer of the *Arians*, a moſt implacable Enemy to the Orthodox, who were by him every-where driven from their Sees and ſent into Exile: nay, he gave full Power to the *Arian* Biſhops and Magiſtrates, to impriſon, fine, beat, rack, and baniſh, at Pleaſure, ſuch of the orthodox Clergy as they could not win over by more gentle Methods. This Power they uſed ſo tyrannically, eſpecially at *Conſtantinople*, that the Clergy of that City reſolved to apply to *Valens* himſelf for Relief, not doubting but the Miſeries they groaned under might, if duly repreſented, even move him to Compaſſion. Accordingly they appointed Eighty of their Body, all Men of unblemiſhed Characters, and known Piety, to repair to *Nicomedia*, where that Prince then was, and lay their Grievances before him. Upon their Arrival at Court, they were introduced to the Emperor, who heard them with great Attention, without ſhewing the leaſt Emotion either of Reſentment or Compaſſion. However, as upon his diſmiſſing them he immediately ſent for *Modeſtus* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, they concluded that he had given Ear to their juſt Complaints, and began to expect a ſpeedy Redreſs of their Grievances. But the Charge he gave him, very different from what they expected, was to diſpatch them all without Mercy or Delay. The Præfect, apprehending the Death of ſo many eminent Eccleſiaſtics might occaſion a Tumult in the City, gave out that the Emperor had ordered them into Exile; and accordingly cauſed them to be put on board a Veſſel, in order to be conveyed, as he pretended, to the Place of their Baniſhment.

Inhumanly treated by the Emperor Valens.

nishment. But the Vessel was no sooner out of Sight, than the Mariners, pursuant to their private instructions, set Fire to it, and betaking themselves to their Boat, left those they had on board to the Mercy of the Flames and Waves y.

The Orthodox divided among themselves.

But *Athanasius*, *Basil*, and the other Champions of the orthodox Party, were not so much alarmed at the cruel Persecution raised against them by their Enemies, as at the unhappy Divisions that reigned at this very Time among themselves. It was to procure a Remedy for these Divisions, to heal a dangerous Schism, that rent the orthodox Party into two opposite Factions, that *Basil*, by the Advice of *Athanasius*, wrote the above-mentioned Letter to *Damasus*, and that the orthodox Bishops, of the East wrote in common a Letter to all their Brethren in the West. As this Schism did more Hurt to the orthodox Cause than it was in the Power of their Enemies to have done, I shall not think it foreign to my Purpose to insert a succinct Account of its Rise and Progress. *Eustathius*, the orthodox Bishop of *Antioch*, being deposed by the *Arians* in 331, and one of their own Party put in his room, the greater Part of the Clergy and People of that City, acknowleging the new-chosen Bishop, and his *Arian* Successors assisted at their Assemblies, mixed with the *Arians*, and received the Sacraments at their Hands, although they disagreed with them in Belief. But some more zealous than the rest, refusing to own any other Bishop so long as *Eustathius* lived, held their Assemblies apart, under the Direction of Presbyters animated with the like Zeal. These, from their steady Attachment to *Eustathius*, were called *Eustathians*, and with them alone *Athanasius* communicated while he was at *Antioch* z. This Schism or Separation continued

What occasioned this Division.

y Socr. l. 4. c. 15. Soz. l. 6. c. 13. Theod. l. 4. c. 21. Naz. or. 20. z Socrat. l. 2. c. 45. Theod. l. 2. 27. ep. 73. c. 28. Hier. chron.

tinued even after the Death of *Euſtathius*, thoſe of his Party declining not only the Communion of the *Arians* and their Biſhops, but of the Orthodox who communicated with them. In the Year 360, the See of *Antioch* being vacant, by the Tranſlation of *Eudoxius* the *Arian* to that of *Conſtantinople*, the *Arians*, and the Orthodox who communicated with them, choſe with one Conſent the famous *Meletius* to ſucceed him. Both Parties joyfully concurred in this Election; the Orthodox, becauſe they knew his Doctrine to be no leſs pure than his Manners; and the *Arians*, becauſe they hoped, by ſuch a diſtinguiſhing Mark of their Friendſhip and Eſteem, to win him, and by his Means to gain over to their Party the whole City of *Antioch*, nay, and the *Euſtathians* themſelves [z]. But they ſoon found, to their great Mortification, that the Orthodox were better acquainted with *Meletius* than they, that he was moſt zealouſly attached to the orthodox Party, and was not to be ſwayed by Friendſhip or Enmity, by Hopes or Terrors. He was no ſooner inſtalled, which Ceremony was performed with the greateſt Solemnity, than he loudly declared in favour of *Conſubſtantiality*, and boldly cut off from his Communion, as rotten and incurable Members, all who held the oppoſite Doctrine. The *Arians* of *Antioch* were thunderſtruck with the Boldneſs of the Attempt; the whole Party took the Alarm; *Eudoxius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and the neighbouring Biſhops, forgetful of every thing elſe, haſtened to *Antioch*: Hopes, Fears, Prayers, Menaces, were ſucceſſively employed, and nothing left unattempted to divert, at leaſt to allay, the impending Storm. But all in vain; the Zeal of *Meletius* was incapable of Controul: he openly declared, that nothing ſhould, nothing could, make him deſiſt from, or relent in, the Work he had undertaken, until he had utterly extirpated the *Arian* Hereſy, without leaving the leaſt Shoot of ſo poiſonous a Weed in

Meletius the new Biſhop of Antioch *declareth in favour of the Orthodox.*

[z] Sozom. l. 4. c. 28.

in the Field, which by divine Appointment he was to guard and cultivate [b]. The *Arians* finding him immovably fixed hin his Resolution, and, what doubled their Concern, the whole Party in imminent Danger from one of their own chusing, applied with better Success to the Emperor *Constantius*; and, charging the new Bishop of *Antioch* with *Sabellianism*, which Charge the credulous and unwary Prince believed upon their Word, they extorted from him a Rescript banishing *Meletius* from *Antioch* about Thirty Days after his Installment, and confining him to *Melitene* in *Armenia*, his native City [c]. *Euzoius* was preferred in his room, formerly the chief Favourite of *Arius*, and the most ancient of all his Disciples; for together with him he was condemned by the great Council of *Nice*.

He is banished.

Great Divisions in that Church.

The Orthodox, who had hitherto communicated with the *Arians*, were so disobliged and scandalized at these Proceedings, that, in the End, they renounced the *Arian* Communion; and, assembling by themselves, proposed an Union with the *Eustathians*. But their Proposal was rejected by the leading Men of that Party, alleging, that they could not admit them to their Communion, because they had for so many Years communicated with the *Arians*, received the Sacraments at their Hands, and still seemed to acknowlege *Meletius* as lawful Bishop, though he had been chosen by the *Arian* Faction: for the *Eustathians*, notwithstanding the heroic Firmness of *Meletius* in defending and promoting the common Cause, refused to own him, for no other Reason but because the *Arians* had had a chief Share in his Election [d]. As this Disagreement greatly weakened the Orthodox Cause in *Antioch*, and might, in time, be attended with fatal Consequences, no Pains

[b] Chrys. or. 45. [c] Chrys. ib. Epiph. c. 38. Soz. l. 4. c. 28. Theodor. l. 2. c. 27. Philost. l. 5. c. 5. [d] Socrat. l. 2. c. 44. Theod. l. 3. c. 12.

Pains were ſpared by the apoſtolic Men of thoſe Times, to induce the *Euſtathians* to abate ſomewhat of their Zeal and Severity. As for the other Party, notwithſtanding their Attachment to *Meletius*, whence they had the Name of *Meletians*, they were greatly inclined to an Accommodation, and ſeemed to court the Communion of the *Euſtathians*, almoſt upon any Terms. *Lucifer*, the famous Biſhop of *Cagliari*, on his Return from *Thebais* in *Egypt*, to which Place he had been confined by *Conſtantius*, was prompted by his Zeal to take *Antioch* in his Way, with a Deſign to mediate an Accommodation between the diſſenting Parties. Being arrived in that City, he had ſeveral Conferences with the leading Men of the one and the other Party; and, finding neither averſe to an Accommodation, he conceived great Hopes of ſucceeding in his Deſign; and therefore begged the Fathers of the Council of *Alexandria*, which was already ſitting, and to which he had been invited by *Athanaſius*, to diſpenſe with his aſſiſting at that Aſſembly, ſince his Preſence ſeemed more neceſſary at *Antioch*. However, he appointed Two of his Deacons to be preſent as his Deputies, injoining them to agree, in his Name, to the Deciſions of the Council[e]. *Baronius* owneth here, which I cannot help obſerving by the way, that *Lucifer* never appeared in the Council of *Alexandria*[f]; forgetting, no doubt, what he elſewhere ſo ſtrenuouſly maintaineth[g]; *viz.* that *Lucifer* aſſiſted at that Aſſembly, in the Name of Pope *Liberius*, and as his Legate.

The Council of Alexandria ſtrives to heal theſe Diviſions.

The Fathers of the Council not only approved of the Biſhop of *Cagliari*'s Reſolution, but appointed *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, and *Aſterius* of *Petra* in *Arabia*, to aſſiſt him in ſo pious an Undertaking. What ſeemed chiefly to obſtruct the ſo much wiſhed for Union was a great Attachment on one Side to *Meletius*, and an equal Obſtinacy on the other, in refuſeing

[e] Ruff. l. 1. c. 20. Socr. l. 3. c. 6. [f] Baron. ad ann. 362. n. 180. [g] Id. ib. n. 206.

ing to acknowledge one preferred by the *Arians*. The Confessors therefore assembled in *Alexandria* (for of Confessors alone that Assembly was composed) were of Opinion, that, if every other Remedy proved ineffectual, their Deputies should apply to *Meletius*; and having persuaded him to resign his Dignity, chuse another in his room, equally acceptable to both Parties. They did not in the least doubt but *Meletius* would readily, nay, with great Joy, sacrifice his Dignity, and every other private View, to the public Tranquillity [h]; so great was the Opinion they entertained of his Virtue. Had this wise Resolution taken place, it had, in all Likelihood, been attended with the desired Effect. But before the Deputies could reach *Antioch*, *Lucifer*, more commendable for Zeal than Prudence, had cut off all means of Accommodation, by conferring of his own Authority, the Episcopal Dignity on the Presbyter *Paulinus*, who was at the Head of the *Eustathians*, and had with more Warmth than any other opposed *Meletius*, and those who adhered to him. He was assisted in that irregular Ordination by Two other Confessors [i]; *viz.* *Gorgonius* of *Germanicia*, and *Cymatius* of *Gabala*, or rather of *Paltos* [k], This Step he took to oblige the *Eustathians*, when he found that they could by no means be induced to acknowlege *Meletius*. But, instead of closing, he thereby widened the Breach, the *Meletians* declaring, that they would never abandon a Bishop of their own Party, to acknowlege one of another, chosen without their Consent, or even their Knowlege [l]. This unhappy Division, thus settled and confirmed between the Two Orthodox Parties in *Antioch*, did not continue long confined to that particular Church, but soon extended to the Church universal; some owning *Meletius* for lawful Bishop of *Antioch*, and others *Paulinus*. *Athanasius* communi-

All Means of an Accommodation cut off by the imprudent Conduct of the Bishop of Cagliari.

[h] Athan. de ant. p. 574---577. [i] Hier. chron. [k] Athan. ep. ad Solit. & de Antioch. Eccl. p. 580. [l] Ruff. l. 1. c. 27 Theod. l. 3. c. 2.

municated with *Paulinus*, and not with *Meletius*; and his Example was followed by the Biſhops of *Egypt*, of *Cyprus*, and all the Biſhops in the Weſt [m]. On the other hand, all the Orthodox Biſhops in the Eaſt, except *Athanaſius*, and thoſe I have mentioned, eſpouſed, with great Warmth, the Cauſe of *Meletius* [n]. They all continued, however, notwithſtanding this Diſagreement, to communicate with each other, although with ſome Indifference and Coldneſs. The Ordination of *Paulinus* gave Riſe to another Schiſm; for *Euſebius* of *Vercelli*, finding, on his Arrival at *Antioch*, all Hopes of an Accommodation cut off, and no room left for the Meaſures concerted and agreed to by the Council, immediately quitted the City, without communicating with either Party. This was condemning the Conduct of *Lucifer*; which he could not brook; and therefore, full of Reſentment, he renounced the Communion of *Euſebius*, with whom he had hitherto lived in the greateſt Intimacy, and ſuffered together with him a moſt painful Exile for the common Cauſe [o].

St. Baſil *Biſhop of* Cæſarea *applieth to* Damaſus.

Baſil Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, one of the great Lights of the Church, left nothing unattempted, which he apprehended could any-ways contribute to the re-uniting of the Orthodox among themſelves, and putting an End to the preſent Schiſm. But, deſpairing at laſt of Succeſs, and finding the Prelates in the Eaſt all warmly engaged in the Diſpute, ſome in favour of *Meletius*, and ſome of *Paulinus*, he reſolved to apply to the Biſhop of *Rome*, who had not yet declared for either of the Competitors, his Thoughts being wholly employed in ſecuring his Dignity againſt a Competitor at home. He wrote therefore to *Damaſus*, intreating him to diſpatch Deputies into the Eaſt, who, in Concert with the Prelates there, inclined to an Accommodation, might ſettle the proper

[m] Idem ibid. c. 30. [n] Idem ibid. [o] Idem ibid. Theod. l. 3. c. 2.

per Means of accompliſhing ſo deſirable a Work, and uniting in Charity thoſe, who were already united in Faith. He added, that it was from his Zeal alone they expected Relief, from that Zeal which he had made ſo eminently appear on other Occaſions; that *Dionyſius*, one of his Predeceſſors, afforded them a ſeaſonable Aſſiſtance, when their Wants were leſs preſſing, and their Condition not ſo deplorable; and therefore that there was no room left to doubt of his readily conforming to ſo glorious an Example [p]. With this Letter, and another from the Biſhops in the Eaſt, ſoliciting the Advice, Aſſiſtance, and Mediation of their Collegues in the Weſt, *Dorotheus*, Deacon of the Church of *Antioch*, was diſpatched into *Italy*; whence he returned in the Beginning of the following Year 372, with an Anſwer from the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, *Italy*, and *Gaul* [q]. But *Damaſus* did not condeſcend to return an Anſwer to *Baſil*, or take the leaſt notice of his Letter; which haughty Conduct he juſtly reſented; and in pretty ſharp Terms, taxing *Damaſus*, in one of his Letters [r], with a Spirit of Pride and Vanity, which made him overlook other Biſhops as below his Attention, and expect to be accoſted by them with the meaneſt Flattery. But his thus diſregarding the Requeſt and Intreaties of the Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, was not owing to his Pride alone. He was ſo little acquainted with the State of the Churches in the Eaſt, and what paſſed there, that he looked upon *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Samoſata*, and *Meletius*, with whom *Baſil* lived in great Intimacy, as rank *Arians*, although they both lived at that very time in Exile, having been driven from their Sees by the *Arians*, on account of the Zeal, which they had, with an invincible Firmneſs, exerted in Defence of the Orthodox Faith [s]. The Biſhop of *Rome* might, with very little Trouble, have been

The haughty Conduct of Damaſus reſented by St. Baſil.

[p] Baſil. epiſt. 320. [q] Idem epiſt. 273. [r] Idem epiſt. 250. [s] Idem ep. 321.

been better informed; but his Mind, it ſeemeth, was ſo deeply engaged in worldly Affairs, and his Thoughts ſo taken up with State, Pomp, and Grandeur, that he was never at Leiſure to mind thoſe Matters, which juſtly claimed, and ought to have engroſſed his whole Attention. By him the Weſtern Biſhops were led into the ſame Miſtake, concerning *Euſebius* and *Meletius*; and hence the Backwardneſs they ſhewed to correſpond with *Baſil*, as if he deſigned to impoſe upon them, or was himſelf impoſed upon by others. Of this *Baſil* juſtly complained in a Letter he wrote to *Euſebius* of *Samoſata*; *If the Wrath of God*, ſaith he, *is in the End appeaſed, if Mercy taketh place, what other Help do we ſtand in need of? But, if his Anger continueth, what Relief will the Pride of the Weſt afford us? They neither know the Truth, nor can they patiently bear it. They are ever prepoſſeſſed with idle Jealouſies, ever ſwayed by groundleſs Surmiſes; and therefore act now the ſame Part they lately acted in the Caſe of* Marcellinus; *that is, they quarrel with thoſe, who inform them of the Truth, and, being left to themſelves, they introduce and eſtabliſh Hereſies. As for my own Part, I had once ſome Thoughts of writing a private Letter to their Chief*, (that is, to *Damaſus*) *and, waving all Mention of Church-Affairs, only tell him, that they neither know what paſſeth here, nor take the right Method to be informed; and that they ought not to oppreſs thoſe who are already humbled by Affliction, nor miſtake Pride for Dignity, ſince that Sin alone is capable of ſetting a Man at Enmity with God*[r]. From theſe Words it is pretty plain, that the Notion of the Pope's Infallibility was not yet broached, or at leaſt was not yet known to *Baſil*. The Biſhop of the Metropolis of the Empire was deſervedly looked upon, in regard of the Dignity of his See, as the Chief and Head of all the Weſtern Biſhops; and to him as ſuch, not as an infallible and unerring Judge, the Eaſtern Biſhops frequently applied in the Diſputes

St. Baſil complaineth of Damaſus, and the Weſtern Biſhops.

r Idem epiſt. 8.

that happened to arise among them; so that all we can infer from their applying to him is, that his Authority bore a great Sway; which was owing to the Pre-eminence of his See, and not to any Power or Prerogative peculiar to him, and superior to others.

Damasus *taketh on him the Office of Judge, being only chosen Mediator.*

It was long ere *Damasus* could be brought to give any Attention to the Affairs of the East; and when he did, it was only to add Fewel to the Fire which had lately begun to rage with great Violence. For, looking upon the Office of a bare Mediator, which alone had been offered him, as no-ways suitable to his Dignity, he arrogantly assumed that of a Judge, and not only acknowleged *Paulinus* for lawful Bishop of *Antioch*, but, misled by false and groundless Reports, declared *Meletius* a Transgressor of the Canons, an Intruder, a Schismatic, and even an Heretic[r]; that *Meletius*, who had suffered Exile, and innumerable Hardships, in Defence of the Orthodox Faith, who was then revered all over the East, as a Man of extraordinary Sanctity, and is now honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint of the first Class. But his thus openly declaring in favour of *Paulinus*, his treating in such a base and unworthy manner one of the most eminent Prelates in the East, served only to engage the Followers of *Meletius* more warmly in his Cause; and the great *Basil*, among the rest, who could not help censuring the Conduct of *Damasus* as rash, partial, and injudicious: he even repented his having ever applied to him; for, in one of his Letters to *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, he expresseth himself thus: *The Saying of* Diomedes *occurreth to my Mind*; Intreaties are not to be used with *Achilles*, he is too haughty[t]; *and truly the more you flatter haughty and insolent Men, the more haughty and insolent they become*[u]. As no Regard was had to the Authority of *Damasus* and the Western Bishops, who, following his Example, acknowleged *Paulinus*, and not *Meletius*,

His Conduct condemned by St. Basil.

[r] Idem ep. 10. [t] Hom. Il. 9. ver. 694. [u] Basil. ep. 10.

tius, the Orthodox Biſhops in the Eaſt not only continued divided among themſelves, but a new Diviſion aroſe between the Weſtern Biſhops, and thoſe of the Party of *Meletius*, at the Head of which was *Baſil* Biſhop of *Cæſarea*. But, of theſe unhappy Diviſions, ſo far as the Biſhops of *Rome* were concerned in them, we ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak hereafter.

New Diſturbances raiſed in Rome, *by the Partiſans of* Urſinus;

Damaſus was far more ſucceſsful in ſuppreſſing the Schiſm of *Urſinus*, which about this Time was revived at *Rome*. The Emperor *Valentinian*, ſome time before, by a Reſcript addreſſed to *Ampelius* Governor, and *Maximinus* Vicar of *Rome*, had allowed *Urſinus*, and the leading Men of his Party, who had been confined with him to *Gaul*, Liberty to live where they pleaſed, provided they kept out of *Rome*, and the Suburbicarian Provinces [w]. This Indulgence ſhewn by the Emperor to *Urſinus* encouraged his Followers in *Rome*, to declare openly in his favour, and even to aſſemble apart from thoſe who communicated with *Damaſus*. But, being therein oppoſed by the Party of *Damaſus* with their uſual Violence, new Diſturbances aroſe, and the City was upon the Point of becoming again the Scene of a Civil War. *Simplicius*, then Vicar of *Rome*, at the Requeſt of *Damaſus*, gave the Emperor immediate Notice of the approaching Danger; and the Emperor, in Anſwer to his Letter, ſent him a Reſcript, commanding *all thoſe, who, in Contempt of Religion, held or frequented unlawful Aſſemblies, to be baniſhed an Hundred Miles from* Rome, *that their Obſtinacy might hurt none but themſelves* [x]. Thus for the preſent a Stop was put to the Diſorders that had begun to reign in the City.

who are baniſhed.

The Luciferians *perſecuted by* Damaſus.

The Two Preſbyters *Marcellinus* and *Fauſtinus* pretend, that this Law was levelled at the *Urſinians* alone,

[w] Cod. Theod. 9. tom. 29. l. 1. p. 221. [x] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 98.

alone, but was interpreted by *Damaſus*, as comprehending the *Luciferians*, or the Followers of *Lucifer*, Biſhop of *Cagliari*, who, refuſing to communicate with the Biſhops who ſigned the Confeſſion of *Rimini*, and with all who communicated with them, had ſeparate Aſſemblies at *Rome*, and even a Biſhop of their own, named *Aurelius*. But *Damaſus*, ſay they, uſing them, in virtue of the above-mentioned Law, with no leſs Cruelty than he did the *Urſinians*, they thenceforth aſſembled only in the Night, under a Preſbyter, named *Macarius*, of whoſe Sanctity and Auſterities they relate wonderful Things. But Night and Darkneſs could not protect them againſt the perſecuting Spirit of *Damaſus*, whoſe Clerks, breaking one Night in upon them, while they were performing Divine Service in a private Houſe, diſperſed the Congregation, ſeized *Macarius*, and dragging him along with them over the ſharp Flints, by which he was cruelly bruiſed, and dangerouſly wounded in the Thigh, they kept him the remaining Part of the Night cloſely confined. Next Morning he was carried before the Judge, who, finding him inflexible in rejecting the Communion of *Damaſus*, condemned him to Exile; but the holy Preſbyter, being arrived at *Oſtia*, died there of his Wounds[y]. The ſame Authors add, that *Damaſus* cauſed ſeveral Catholic Preſbyters to be ſent into Exile, and ſome Laymen; but that *Aurelius*, the *Luciferian* Biſhop, in ſpite of all his Efforts, continued in *Rome* to the Hour of his Death[z].

Apollinaris *the Hereſiarch. An Account of him.*

About this Time, that is, in the Year 377, a great Council was held at *Rome*, in which the famous *Apollinaris*, Biſhop of *Laodicea* in *Syria*, was condemned and depoſed with his Two Diſciples *Vitalis* and *Timotheus*. *Apollinaris* was a Man of uncommon Parts, great Penetration, univerſal Knowlege, and had at firſt been ſo zealous a Defender of the Orthodox Faith, that he was looked upon by all, particularly

[y] Marc. & Fauſt. p. 65—69. [z] Idem ibid.

larly by *Epiphanius* and *Athanaſius*, as one of the great Champions of that Cauſe [a], and ranked by *Philoſtorgius* with *Baſil*, and *Gregory Nazianzen* [b]. He contracted a ſtrict Friendſhip with *Athanaſius*, when that Prelate paſſed through *Laodicea* in 349, on his Return to *Egypt*, and ever after maintained a cloſe Correſpondence with him, on which account he was excommunicated by *Gregory* the *Arian* Biſhop of that City [c]. When the *Arians* began to prevail in the Eaſt, *Apollinaris* was cruelly perſecuted by the Men in Power of that Party, and at laſt driven into Exile [d]. *Baſil* wrote ſeveral Letters to him, and in thoſe he wrote to others often mentioneth him as a Perſon for whom he had the greateſt Eſteem [e]. He is ſaid to have excelled in the Knowlege of the Scriptures, which he publicly interpreted at *Antioch*, where he had *Jerom* among the many Diſciples, who flocked from all Parts to hear him [f]. But he was equally verſed in human Learning, eſpecially in Poetry; and his Knowlege in that Branch of Literature proved very uſeful in the Time of the Emperor *Julian*. For that Prince having by a Law debarred the Chriſtians from peruſing or ſtudying the Pagan Authors, *Apollinaris*, to ſupply the Want of thoſe Writers, compoſed ſeveral Pieces in Imitation of them, and, among the reſt, a Poem compriſing the Hiſtory of the *Jews* to the Time of *Saul*, and divided into Twenty-four Books, which he diſtinguiſhed by ſo many Letters of the *Greek* Alphabet, as *Homer* had done [g]. He likewiſe wrote Comedies, Tragedies, Lyric Verſes, *&c.* imitating *Pindar* in the latter, and *Menander* and *Euripides* in the Two former [h]. *Sozomen* thinketh his Compoſitions fell in no reſpect ſhort of the Works of the Antients; who, upon the Whole, ſaith he, were far inferior to him, ſince

[a] Baſil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 24. Hieron. vir. ill. c. 104.
[b] Suidas, p. 373. [c] Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [d] Nil. l. 1. ep. 257.
[e] Baſil. ep. 82. [f] Hier. ep. 65. [g] Soz. l. 5. c. 18. [h] Id. ib.

since they excelled, each in one Kind only, but he equally in all[i]. The Tragedy, intituled, *Christ suffering*, which is to be found among the Works of *Gregory Nazianzen*, is by some ascribed to *Apollinaris*; but that Piece doth not at all answer the great Opinion *Sozomen* seemeth to have entertained of him. His Paraphrase in Hexameter Verse on the Psalms, the only intire Work of his that hath reached our Times, is an elegant, exact, and sublime Translation of them, greatly commended and admired by the best Judges[k]. His Poetry proved very serviceable to him, when he began to broach his Heresy; for great Numbers of People, especially Women, embraced his Doctrine, being taken, and in a manner inchanted, with the Sweetness of his Verses; for he composed a great many Songs and Odes equally pious and elegant, adapted to all Occasions, and on all Occasions sung with suitable Airs by his Followers[l]. To these *Gregory Nazianzen* no doubt alludeth, where he speaketh of the Psalms of the *Apollinarists*, to which the Psalms of *David* had given place; of those sweet and so much admired Verses, which were looked upon by them as a Third Testament[m]. It was chiefly to oppose the Progress *Apollinaris* made, by the insinuating Means of his Poetry, that *Gregory Nazianzen* applied himself to the same Study. About the Year 362, *Apollinaris* was raised, in Consideration of his great Piety and Learning, to the See of *Laodicea* in *Syria*, in which City he was born, according to the most probable Opinion, and had spent the greater Part of his Life.

The Doctrine held by Apollinaris *and his Disciples.*

As for the Doctrine held by *Apollinaris*, and his Followers, called from him *Apollinarists*; they maintained at first, that *Christ* had human Flesh, but not a human Soul, the Want of which was supplied, according to them, by the Divinity. But being afterwards

[i] Idem ibid. [k] Voss. poet. Græc. c. 9. p. 76. Baillet, t. 6. p. 453, 455. [l] Sozom. l. 6. c. 25. [m] Naz. or. 52. p. 745.

wards convinced, that ſuch a Doctrine was repugnant to ſeveral plain and expreſs Paſſages of Scripture, they abandoned it in Part; and, diſtinguiſhing, with ſome Philoſophers, the Soul, by which we live, from the Intelligence, by which we reaſon, they allowed the former in our *Saviour*, but denied the latter; the Operations of which, ſaid they, were performed by the Divinity [n]. Thus they allowed him, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, the Soul of a Beaſt, but denied him that of a Man [o]. By means of this Doctrine they avoided the Abſurdity with which they reproached the Catholics, admitting in Chriſt, as they falſly imagined, Two oppoſite and diſtinct Natures, without any Union or Subordination between them [p]. The Catholics indeed acknowleged Two diſtinct and complete Natures in Chriſt, but at the ſame time maintained an Union between them, ſuch an Union as was admitted by the *Apollinariſts* between the Fleſh and the Divinity. The latter upbraided the Catholics with adoring a Man, ſtyling them *Anthropolaters*, and the Catholics reproached in their Turn the *Apollinariſts* with adoring the Fleſh, calling them *Sarcolaters* [q]. The *Apollinariſts* diſtinguiſhed themſelves from the Catholics, by cauſing the following Words to be fixed on the Front of their Houſes; *We muſt not adore a Man that beareth a God, but a God that beareth Fleſh.* The Errors of the *Apollinariſts* were not only concerning the Soul, but likewiſe the Body of our Saviour; for they maintained, that his Body, like other Bodies only in Appearance, was coeval with the Divinity, and of the ſame Subſtance with the eternal Wiſdom [r]. Hence it followed, by a natural Conſequence, that the Body of our Saviour was impaſſible, and immortal; that it was not taken of the Virgin

[n] Epiph. 77. c. 23. Theod. hær. 4. c. 8. Athan. de incar. p. 615. Nem. l. 1. p. 710. Naz. orat. 46. p. 722. [o] Aug. in Jo. hom. 47. [p] Naz. or. 52. p. 749. [q] Nyſ. in apol. l. 2. p. 47. Naz. car. 146. [r] Athan. ad Epiph, 582. Aug. perſ. c. 24. & hær. 55. Theod. l. 5. c. 3. Naz. or. 51.

Virgin *Mary*; that he was not born of her; that his Birth, Passion, Death, and Resurrection, were mere Illusions; or else, that the Divine Nature was passible: both which Absurdities were admitted by some of the Sects into which the *Apollinarists* were afterwards divided [r].

Apollinaris not known nor suspected to be the Author of the Heresy he broached.

This Doctrine was first heard of in 362, and condemned the same Year in the Council of *Alexandria*. In 373 it began to make a great Noise in the Church; but it was not known even then by whom it had been broached: for *Apollinaris* was so far from owning himself the Author of those Tenets, that, in one of his Letters to *Serapion* Bishop of *Thmuis* in *Egypt*, which is still extant [t], he expresseth, in the strongest Terms, his Approbation of a Letter from *Athanasius* to *Epictetus* Bishop of *Corinth*, confuting the very Errors he held; and at the same time condemneth the Folly of those, who maintained the Flesh to be consubstantial to the Divine Nature. In another Letter to the same *Serapion*, he owns the Body of our Saviour to have been taken of the Virgin *Mary*, to have been formed in her Womb, and his Flesh to have been of the same Substance with ours; adding, *And these are Truths not to be called in question* [u]. In a Third Letter he assureth *Serapion*, that he hath ever denied in his Writings the Flesh of our Saviour to have descended from Heaven, or to be of the same Substance with the Divinity [w]. *Apollinaris*, by thus publicly declaring against the Doctrine, which at the same time he was privately propagating, eluded the Vigilance of *Athanasius* himself, who, in confuting his Errors, never mentioneth his Name, nor seemeth to have entertained the least Suspicion of him; nay, he recommended *Timotheus*, a favourite Disciple of his, to *Damasus*, as a Person whose Orthodoxy was not to be questioned; and as such he was received, not

[r] Athan. ib. p. 583. Naz. or. 46. Nil. l. 1. ep. 157. Theod. l. 5. c. 3. [t] Leont. p. 1031. [u] Id. p. 1032. [w] Id. p. 1035.

not only by the Biſhop of *Rome*, but by all the Weſtern Biſhops, of whom he obtained Letters, on his Return, directed to *Apollinaris*, as to a Biſhop of the Catholic Communion [x].

His Errors condemned in a Council at Rome.

In the Year 374, or 375, *Damaſus* convened a great Council at *Rome*, in which the Errors of *Apollinaris* were condemned; but neither was he nor any other named as the Broacher or Author of that Doctrine. The very Year that *Damaſus* condemned the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*, he was deceived and over-reached by one of the Diſciples of that Hereſiarch, named *Vitalis*. He was a Preſbyter of the Church of *Antioch*, and of the Communion of *Meletius*, by whom he had been ordained; but afterwards, renouncing his Communion, he joined *Apollinaris*, and, being in high Eſteem with the People, drew great Numbers over with him to that Side. Of theſe, called from him *Vitalians*, *Apollinaris* ſome Years after appointed him Biſhop, adding thereby a Fourth Party to the Three that already divided the Church of *Antioch*, *viz.* the *Arians*, *Paulinians*, and *Meletians* [y]. Before he threw off the Maſk, and publicly maintained the Tenets of *Apollinaris*, he ſtrove to be admitted with his Followers to the Communion of *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, and of *Damaſus*; and with this View he undertook a Journey to *Rome* in the Year 375. As he had been ſuſpected, and even accuſed of holding the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*, *Damaſus* required of him, before he admitted him to his Communion, a Confeſſion of his Faith, which he gave under his Hand, but in ſuch Terms as bore a double Meaning. *Damaſus*, however, well ſatisfied with it, gave him a Letter for *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, and ſent him back to be admitted by that Biſhop to the Communion of the Church [z]. But *Damaſus*

Damaſus impoſed upon by Vitalis one of his Diſciples.

[x] Idem p. 1042. [y] Epi. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. Chron. Alex. p. 688. [z] Epiph. 77. c. 20. Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Naz. or. 52.

masus soon after, either upon his own Reflection, or at the Suggestion of others, apprehending himself imposed upon, wrote another Letter to *Paulinus*, by the Presbyter *Petronius*, and afterwards a Third, which *Holstenius* hath inserted at Length in his *Roman Collection*[a]. Together with this Letter *Damasus* sent to *Paulinus* a Confession of Faith, drawn up by a Council summoned for that Purpose, desiring him to admit none to his Communion, but such as should sign that Confession, and the Confession of *Nice*[b]. To this Piece the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* no doubt allude, in commending *Damasus* for pointing out in his Letter to *Paulinus*, the Rules all Catholics ought to be guided by in reasoning of the Mystery of the Incarnation[c]. What *Baronius* observeth here is true, *viz.* that *Vitalis*, by the same ambiguous Confession of Faith, imposed upon *Gregory Nazianzen*, who received the *Apollinarists* as Brethren, and not as Enemies[d]. He addeth, *And no wonder that* Vitalis *imposed upon* Damasus, *since by the same Confession he imposed upon* Gregory Nazianzen: he ought rather to have said, *No wonder that he imposed upon* Gregory, *who did not pretend to Infallibility, since he imposed upon* Damasus, *who was infallible*. As *Vitalis* refused to sign the Confession sent by *Damasus*, *Paulinus* would not admit him to his Communion; upon which he pulled off the Mask, publicly renounced the Communion both of *Damasus* and *Paulinus*, and, bidding Defiance to the Canons, accepted the Title and Dignity of Bishop of *Antioch*, offered him by *Apollinaris*. At the same time that Heresiarch, finding he could conceal himself no longer, openly declared, that he would communicate with none, who held, that our Saviour had taken a human Soul, and human Understanding: which was separating himself from the Communion of

Apollinaris openly declareth against the Church.

[a] Vet. Rom. eccles. mon. collect. p. 181. [b] Ib. p. 180. & Theod. l. 5. c. 10. [c] Conc. t. 4. p. 826. [d] Naz. or. 51.

of the Catholic Church[e]. It was long before it was believed in the Church that thoſe Tenets had been broached, or were held by *Apollinaris*: no Credit was given, at firſt, even to his Diſciples, moſt People being inclined to think, that they were miſtaken, and did not comprehend the ſublime Thoughts of that great Man[f]. But when no room was left for any further Doubt, the Surprize and Concern of the whole Catholic Party were equal to the high Opinion they had entertained of him until that Time[g]. When *Epiphanius* wrote againſt the *Apollinariſts*, he well knew *Apollinaris* to be the Author of that Sect; for he reproacheth him with this unwarrantable Separation from the Church; and yet he ſpeaketh of him with the greateſt Reſpect; ſeemeth to think, that many Things had been unjuſtly fathered upon him; and taketh a great deal of Pains to aſſure his Reader, that what he writeth is Truth, and not Calumny proceeding from any private Pique, Malice, or Grudge[h].

A great Schiſm in the Church.

The Schiſm, which the eſtabliſhing of a new Biſhop occaſioned in the Church of *Antioch*, was not confined to that alone, but extended to moſt other Churches, over which *Apollinaris* appointed Biſhops of his own Sect, who held ſeparate Aſſemblies, practiſed different Rites, and, inſtead of the ſacred Hymns commonly ſung at Divine Service by the reſt of the Church, introduced Canticles compoſed by their Leader, and containing the Subſtance of his Doctrine[i]. The many perplexed Queſtions and Difficulties, which he and his Emiſſaries were daily ſtarting about the Incarnation, bred ſuch Confuſion in the Minds of Men, that many began to queſtion the Truth of that Myſtery[k]. The Objections they moved againſt our Saviour's taking Fleſh, and being born of the Virgin *Mary*, ſeemed calculated merely to

[e] Theod. l. 5. c. 4. Facund. l. 4. c. 2. [f] Nil. ep. 257.
[g] Baſil. ep. 293. Epiph. 77. c. 34. [h] Epiph. 66. c. 20, 77. c. 2. [i] Baſil. ep. 293. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [k] Baſil. ibid.

to raise improper Ideas, and sully the Thoughts of chaste Minds; for they themselves held his Body to be coeval with the Divinity, and to have only been conveyed into the World by means of the Virgin *Mary*[l]. Their Doctrine was applauded and received by many, and few who read their Books were content with, or kept to the plain and antient Doctrine of the Church[m]. *Basil* therefore, and the other orthodox Bishops in the East, to put a Stop the more effectually to the growing Evil, not only declaimed against it in all their Writings, but dispatched the Two Presbyters *Dorotheus* and *Sanctissimus* with Letters to *Damasus* and the other Western Bishops, intreating them to condemn without Delay the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*, and *Apollinaris* himself, since he had at last openly declared against the Church, and owned himself the Author of the new Sect[n]. In Compliance with this Request, a great Council was convened at *Rome* the following Year 378, in which *Apollinaris* was not only condemned with great Solemnity, but deposed, with his Two favourite Disciples, *Vitalis* and *Timotheus*; the former Bishop of the *Apollinarists* at *Antioch*, and the latter at *Berytus* in *Phœnicia*[o]. By the same Council it was defined, that *Jesus* was true Man and true God; and whoever maintained or asserted any thing to be wanting either to his Humanity or Divinity, was declared an Enemy to the Church[p]. *Vitalis* had deceived *Damasus*, as I have observed above, by a Confession of Faith, in which, under equivocal Terms, he had artfully concealed his Heresy. The Bishop of *Rome* therefore, now undeceived, caused the Confession he had formerly approved of to be anathematized by the Council, together with its Author, exerting himself, saith *Gregory Nazianzen*, with so

Basil recurreth to the Western Bishops,

who condemn the Doctrine of Apollinaris, *and depose him with* Vitalis *and* Timotheus.

[l] Naz. or. 46. & 5. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. [m] Basil. ep. 74. [n] Idem ibid. [o] Ruff. l. 2. c. 20. Soz. l. 6. c. 25. [p] Ruff. ibid. Theod. p. 719. Concil. t. 5. p. 741. Leon. Sulp. p. 1042. Phot. p. 231.

so much the more Vigour against them, as they had formerly taken Advantage of his Candour and Sincerity to impose upon him [q]. *Gregory Nazianzen* therefore supposes, that the Pope could be imposed upon in a Matter concerning the Faith. Indeed the Sticklers for Infallibility must either give up that Prerogative, or allow all the Fathers to have talked Nonsense.

A Mistake of Baronius.

Baronius is certainly mistaken, and so was *Ruffinus* [r], whom he followeth, in asserting the Heresy of *Apollinaris* to have been first condemned by the Council of *Rome*, since it is manifest, that the Doctrine of that Heresiarch had been condemned long before by *Athanasius*, *Basil*, and *Epiphanius*, in their Writings, and by the Council held at *Alexandria* in 362. But *Ruffinus* probably meant no more, than that those Errors were first condemned by the Council of *Rome*, under the Name, and together with the Person of *Apollinaris*; which is undeniable. I cannot help observing here another Mistake of *Baronius*, pretending that *Damasus* (for whatever was done by the Council is by him ascribed to *Damasus* alone) in condemning *Apollinaris*, condemned all the Errors he held; and consequently the Opinion of the *Millenarians*, holding that *Christ* was to return upon the Earth, and reign over the Faithful a Thousand Years before the End of the World. This Opinion was first broached about the Year 118, by *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, a Man of great Piety, and honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint [f]. He declareth, in the few Fragments of his Works, which have been conveyed to us by *Eusebius* [t], that, as he lived near the Times of the Apostles, he made it his chief Business to learn of their Disciples whatever they could recollect to have been done or said by them, on different Occasions, that was not recorded in Holy

Another Mistake of the same Writer.

The Doctrine of the Millenarians *held by the greatest Men in the Church.*

[q] Gregor. Naz. or. 52. [r] Ruff. ibid. [f] Martyrol. Rom. 22 Feb. [t] Euseb. l. 3. c. 33.

ly Writ. Thus he learned the above-mentioned Doctrine [u], which, upon the Authority of such a Tradition, countenanced by some Passages in the *Revelations* [w], and one Text in St. *Paul*, was embraced and held by the most eminent Men for Piety and Learning, at that Time, in the Church; and, among the rest, by *Irenæus*, and *Justin* the Martyr. And yet such a Doctrine is now rank Heresy in the Church of *Rome*. But, by declaring it such, have they not overset their own System, which placeth Tradition upon a Level with the Canonical Books of the Scripture? Can they allege a more antient Tradition, one more universally received, or equally countenanced by Scripture, in favour of the many traditional Articles of Faith, which they have obtruded upon the World? *Papias* declareth, he received the above-mentioned Doctrine of those who had learned it immediately of the Apostles. If such a Tradition be rejected as false, what other hath a Right to be admitted as true? If we deny or question St. *Peter*'s having been at *Rome*, Tradition, and the Authority of *Irenæus* (for all the others have copied from him) are immediately produced against us. But what Weight either ought to bear, the Case before us sufficiently demonstrateth.

How little Tradition to be depended upon.

To return to *Apollinaris*: It is very certain, that he held and taught the Doctrine of the *Millenarians*; but it is no less certain, that such Doctrine was not condemned, as *Baronius* pretendeth [x], by the Council of *Rome* in 378, since many eminent Men in the Church held it, and *Sulpitius Severus* among the rest, after that Council, without being deemed Heretics on that score. The Sentence, pronounced against *Apollinaris*, and his Disciples, by the Council of *Rome*, was confirmed by a Council held the same Year at *Alexandria* [y], by an Oecumenical Council assem-

The Apollinarists *condemned by several Councils.*

[u] Id. ib. [w] Revel. c. 20. [x] Baron. ad ann. 118. n. 2. & 373. n. 14. [y] Ruff. l. 2. c. 20.

assembled at *Constantinople* in 381, and by the Council of *Antioch* in 379 [z]. However the *Apollinarists* although thus condemned and deposed by all the Councils of the East and West, as we read in *Gregory Nazianzen* [a], still kept their Ground, until Recourse was had to the Secular Power. For the Emperor *Theodosius*, at the Request of *Nectarius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, enacted a Law, dated the Tenth of *March* 388, forbidding the *Apollinarists* to hold Assemblies, to have any Ecclesiastics or Bishops, or to dwell in the Cities [b]. As this Law was executed with the utmost Rigour, at least against the leading Men of the Party, who were banished the Cities, and confined to the Deserts [c], the *Apollinarists* were in a few Years reduced to a very small Number, when they begged to be admitted to the Communion of the Catholic Church, which was in the end granted them by *Theodotus* [d], who governed the Church of *Antioch*, from the Year 416, to 428. But as their Conversion was owing not to Conviction, but Persecution, they still held in their Hearts the same Sentiments, which ever must happen in the like Case; nay, and privately instilled their Errors into the Minds of many, whose Faith had been, until that Time, untainted [e]. It was to these pretended Catholics or disguised *Apollinarists*, that the *Eutychian* Heresy, and that of the *Monothelites*, of whom I shall speak hereafter, owed their Birth [f]. Hence the Emperor *Marcian*, by an Edict in 455, declared the *Eutychians* to be *Apollinarists*, and consequently liable to the same Penalties [g]. As for *Apollinaris* himself, he died about the Year 392, having maintained, to the Hour of his Death, the same Sentiments, in which he had lived; and, with them, the same outward

Penal Laws enacted against them.

[z] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99. Prædestinat. de hæres. c. 55. a Naz. ep. 77. [b] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 14. p. 130. [c] Soz. l. 6. c. 26. [d] Theod. l. 5. c. 3. [e] Id. ib. [f] Leo. ep. 134, c. 2. Pet. dog. t. 4. p. 24. [g] Conc. t. 4 p. 886, 887.

ward Appearance, at least, of a most holy and exemplary Life [h], which is all the Authors of those Times will allow him.

New Disturbances raised by Ursinus.

While *Damasus*, and the other Western Bishops, were wholly intent upon suppressing the Heresy of *Apollinaris*, and restoring the Eastern Churches to their former Tranquillity, the Antipope *Ursinus*, laying hold of that Opportunity, arrived privately at *Milan*, and there joined the *Arians*, upon their promising to support him with the whole Power of their Party [i]. But *Ambrose*, who then governed that Church, and kept a watchful Eye over the Flock committed to his Care, gave immediate Notice of their clandestine Meetings, and pernicious Designs, to the Emperor *Gratian*, who soon after ordered *Ursinus* to quit *Italy*, and confined him to *Cologne* [k]. During his Exile his Partisans were not idle; they found the Emperor *Gratian*, who in 375 had succeeded his Father *Valentinian* I. warmly engaged in favour of *Damasus:* they well knew, that so long as he continued in that Disposition, it would be in vain to solicit the Return of *Urcinus*, or to put up any Petition in his Behalf. In order therefore to estrange the Mind of the Emperor from *Damasus*, they suborned a *Jew* named *Isaac*, who had embraced the Christian Religion, but was then returned to Judaism, to accuse him before the Civil Magistrate of an heinous Crime, which I find not specified by any of the Antients. But the Emperor, taking upon himself the judging of that Cause, soon discovered the Innocence of the Accused, and the Malice of the Accuser; and therefore, honourably acquitting the former, and punishing the latter according to his Deserts, confined him to a Corner of *Spain* [l].

Damasus falsly accused but cleared by the Emperor.

This Attempt on the Reputation of *Damasus* was not the only Thing that gave him great Uneasiness at

[h] Hier. vir. ill. c. 104. Nil. l. 1. ep. 257. Greg. Nyss. in Ephr. 3. p. 609. [i] Amb. ep. 4. [k] Cod. Theod. ap. 82, 92. Co d. Theod. ap. p. 84---92.

at this Time. The Emperor *Valentinian* had transferred, as I have related above, the Power of judgeing Biſhops, ſuch at leaſt as were concerned in the Schiſm of *Urſinus*, from the Civil Magiſtrate to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But ſeveral Biſhops, although depoſed by him, ſtill maintained themſelves in their Sees, with open Force, in Defiance of his Sentence, and the Imperial Law. Among theſe were the Biſhop of *Parma*, and *Florentius* Biſhop of *Puzzuolo*, who, for their Attachment to *Urſinus*, had been both depoſed by *Damaſus*, and other Biſhops aſſembled at *Rome* [m]. The *Donatiſts* too notwithſtanding the ſevere Laws enacted againſt them by ſeveral Emperors, had got footing in *Italy*, and in *Rome* itſelf, where they were known by the Names of *Montanenſes*, and *Rupenſes*, on account of their aſſembling in a Church or Oratory, which they had among the neighbouring Rocks and Mountains [n]. They had a Biſhop of their own, either ſent from *Africa*, or ordained by Biſhops ſent from thence for that Purpoſe. *Claudian*, who governed them at this Time, was their Fifth Biſhop of *Rome* [o]. The Emperor ordered him to be ſent back to *Africa*, whence he came. But although he had been ſeveral times impriſoned in order to oblige him by that means to return, he could not even ſo be prevailed upon to abandon his Flock; but continued at *Rome*, perverting many there, and rebaptizing all he could pervert [p]. To put a ſtop to theſe Evils, the Biſhops of *Italy*, aſſembling at *Rome*, had recourſe to the Emperor *Gratian*, acquainting him with the Conduct of the contumacious Biſhops, and earneſtly intreating him to cauſe the Law, commanding the Biſhops to be judged by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and not by the Civil Magiſtrate, which he himſelf had enacted

Some Biſhops depoſed by Damaſus, keep their Sees.

The Italian Biſhops recur to the Emperor.

[m] Ibidem p. 82--93. [n] Opt. l. 2. p. 49. Aug. de Unit. c. 3. t. 7. & ep. 165. Hier. chron. [o] Opt. l. 2 p. 49. [p] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 83, 84.

acted with his Father, to be put in Execution. By that Law the Emperor, in all likelihood, only intended to confirm, with respect to the Bishop of *Rome*, the Canons of the Church, appointing the Metropolitan, with his Council, Judge of the Bishops of his Province in Ecclesiastical Causes. But the Bishops, assembled on this Occasion at *Rome*, attempted to extend the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, far beyond the Bounds to which the Emperors and Canons had confined it. For, in their Letter to *Gratian*, they suggested the following Regulations as necessary for the Tranquillity of the Church, and intreated him to establish them by Law: 1. That if any, who had been condemned by the Bishop of *Rome*, or other Catholic Bishops, should, after such Condemnation, presume to keep their Churches, they should be banished from the Territories of the Cities, where they had been Bishops. 2. That such as should refuse, when lawfully summoned to appear before the Bishops, should be obliged, by the Præfect of *Italy*, or his Vicar, to repair to *Rome*, to be judged there. 3. That if the accused Bishop resided in a distant Province, he should be obliged, by the Judges of the Place, to appear before his Metropolitan; and, if his Metropolitan was suspected as partial, or prejudiced against him, he might be allowed to appeal to the Bishop of *Rome*, or to a Council of Fifteen neighbouring Bishops; but, if the Accused was himself a Metropolitan, he should either repair to *Rome*, or appear before such Judges as the Bishop of *Rome* should appoint; and, when thus condemned, acquiesce to the Sentence [q]. In Behalf of the Bishop of *Rome* in particular they begged, in the same Letter, that, as he *was above other Bishops, by the Prerogative of the Apostolic See, although upon a Level with them as to the Ministry*, he might not be obliged to appear before the Civil Magistrate, since other Bishops had been exempted from their Jurisdiction,

Their Letter to him.

What they demand in particular for the Bishop of Rome.

[q] Ibidem p. 85--87.

diction, but before a Council; or that the Emperor would reſerve to himſelf the Cogniſance of what concerned him, leaving to the ordinary Judges the Power of examining Facts and Witneſſes, but not the Authority of pronouncing Sentence [r]. What Anſwer the Emperor returned to the Council, we know not; but, in a Reſcript, addreſſed to the Vicar *Aquilinus*, after ſumming up the Heads of the Letter from the Council, and ſeverely reprimanding his Officers for their Neglect, in not cauſing the Imperial Law to be put in Execution, he confirms the Reſcript addreſſed to *Simplicius*, which I have mentioned above; commands the Biſhop of *Parma*, *Florentius* of *Puzzuolo*, and *Claudian* the *Donatiſt*, with all thoſe who ſhall be condemned by the Councils, as Diſturbers of the Quiet of the Church, to be driven from their Dioceſes, and baniſhed an Hundred Miles from *Rome:* he granteth all the Council had deſired, with reſpect to the judging of Biſhops; but requires the Biſhop of *Rome* to act with the Advice of Five or Seven other Biſhops; and, laſtly, he forbiddeth Perſons of infamous Characters, or known Slanderers, to be admitted as Informers, or Witneſſes againſt Biſhops [s]. In this Reſcript he taketh no notice of what the Council had aſked for the Biſhop of *Rome* in particular.

The Emperor's Anſwer.

From theſe Pieces, which are ſtill extant, it is manifeſt beyond all Diſpute, as the Reader muſt have obſerved, that, in the Year 378, when this Council was held, no Prerogative was yet diſcovered in the Pope, peculiar to him, and not common to all Biſhops, beſides that of Rank, which aroſe from the Dignity of his See, that is, from his being Biſhop of the Metropolis of the Empire; for, in that reſpect alone, the Biſhops, who compoſed the Council, acknowleged him *to be above them*; nay, by declaring themſelves, in expreſs Terms, *equal to him as to the Miniſtry*, they ſeem to have taken particular Care,

In what Senſe the Pope above other Biſhops.

[r] Ibid, p. 87--89. [s] Ibid. p. 90, 91.

that no room or Pretence ſhould be left for his claiming a Superiority in any other reſpect. And how great would their Surprize have been, had *Damaſus*, in hearing that Part of their Addreſs to the Emperor, ſtarted up, and, proteſting againſt it, as derogatory to his Prerogative, declared, that, *to him all Power was given in Heaven and on Eearth*; that, *ſo far from being equal to him, they, and all other Biſhops, were but his Deputies and Delegates*; that *the Power, Authority, and Juriſdiction, which they enjoyed, were derived to them from the Plenitude of his!* Had he talked in this Strain, the whole Council would have concluded him delirious. And yet theſe are the Sentiments of his Succeſſors; theſe the very Words, with which they and their Divines have expreſſed them [t]; ſo that it is now reckoned Hereſy not to believe what in the Fourth Century it had been deemed Madneſs to have gravely uttered. It would perhaps have ſeemed ſtill more ſtrange and ſurpriſing to the Fathers of the Council, however prejudiced in his Favour, if *Damaſus*, inſtead of gratefully acknowleging their Regard for him in petitioning the Emperor, that he might not be judged by the Civil Magiſtrate, but either by a Council, or the Emperor himſelf, had ſeverely rebuked them as Strangers to, or Betrayers of, his inherent Right, acquainting them, that, in virtue thereof, *all Men were to be judged by him, but himſelf by no Man* [u]; that *the greateſt Monarchs were his Slaves and Vaſſals, and he King of Kings, Monarch of the World, ſole Lord and Governor both in Spirituals and Temporals* [w]; that *he was appointed Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms* [x]; that *his Power excelled all Powers* [y]; that *it was neceſſary to Salvation for every human Creature to be ſubject to him* [z].

The Power he now claimeth unknown in the Time of Damaſus.

t Bellarum. de ſumm. Pont. l. 4. c. 24. Aug. Triumph. de poteſt. Eccleſ. in præfa. ad Joh. xxii. Concil. Later ſub Leone X.
u Grat. diſt. 40. c. 6. w Bonif. VIII. in apt. ad Mart. Polon. & Conc. Vienn. p. 909. x Pius V. in Bull. apud Camb. ad ann. 1570. y Sext. V. in Bull. contr. Hen. Nav.

him [z]. And yet theſe are the Notions, that have been uttered by his Succeſſors, and the very Terms in which they were uttered. In the Age I am now writing of, they had been looked upon no otherwiſe than the Ravings of a diſtempered Brain; but they are now held by the Church of *Rome*, and her Divines, as Oracles, and inſerted as ſuch into her Canons. *Bellarmine* owns, that, in the Fourth Century, the Pope was ſtill ſubject to the Emperors, nay, and to the Civil Magiſtrate, without the leaſt Diſtinction between him and other Vaſſals. *But this Subjection*, ſaith he, in his Apology againſt King *James* [a], *the Emperors exacted by Force, becauſe the Power of the Pope was not known to them.* Nor to any body elſe, he might have added, ſince the Writers of thoſe Times ſeem to have been no better acquainted with the Power of the Pope than the Emperors: at leaſt, they take no notice of it, even in deſcribing, as ſome of them have done, the State of the Church at the Time they wrote, and relating the Cuſtoms, Laws, and Practices that then obtained. Beſides, how could the Power of the Pope be unknown to the Chriſtian Emperors, if it was one of the chief Tenets of the Chriſtian Doctrine? Neither *Damaſus*, nor any of his Predeceſſors, can be juſtly charged with Baſhfulneſs, in acquainting the World with the Power they had, or claimed. We may further obſerve here, that the Emperor requires the Biſhop of *Rome*, in judging according to the Power granted him, to act with the Advice of Five or Seven other Biſhops: a plain Proof that he was as little acquainted with the Pope's Infallibility, as with his Power.

The Council of the *Italian* Biſhops, aſſembled at *Rome*, no ſooner broke up, than the Emiſſaries and Partiſans of *Urſinus* began to raiſe new Diſturbances in

[z] Bonif. VIII. extrav. com. l. 1. tit. 8. c. 1. [a] Bellar. ap. p. 202.

A new Accusation brought against Damasus.

in that City, by stirring up the Pagans against *Damasus*, and, at the same time, charging him *with Things*, to use the Expression of the Council of *Aquileia*, *not fit to be uttered by a Bishop, nor heard by such an Emperor as* Gratian [b]. *Anastasius* writes, that he was accused of Adultery by the Two Deacons *Concordus* and *Callistus* [c]. And truly, that some Crime of that Nature was laid to his Charge, is pretty plain, from the Terms in which it was expressed by the Council. *Valerian*, then Governor of *Rome*, immediately acquainted the Emperor with the Accusation [d]; but what Part *Gratian* acted on this Occasion, we are not told by any antient Writer. We read in the Pontificals, and most of the modern Writers, that the Cause was referred by the Emperor to the Council then sitting at *Aquileia*; and that *Damasus* was declared innocent by all the Bishops who composed it. But, as neither is related by any credible Author, I am inclined to believe, that *Gratian* took no notice of the Charge, in Compliance with the Request of the Bishops assembled at *Aquileia*; for, by a Letter, they earnestly intreated him not to hearken to *Ursinus*, because his giving ear to him would occasion endless Disturbances in *Rome*; and besides, they could by no means communicate with a Man who thus wickedly aspired to a Dignity, to which he had no Claim or Title; who, by his scandalous Behaviour, had incurred the Hatred of all good Christians; who had impiously joined the *Arians*, and, together with them, attempted to disturb the Quiet of the Catholic Church of *Milan* [e].

The Council of Aquileia *writeth to the Emperor in his Behalf*

A great Council assembled at Constantinople, *by the Emperor* Theodosius;

Towards the Latter-end of the Pontificate of *Damasus*, Two great Councils were held, the One at *Constantinople* in 381, and the other at *Rome* in 382. The former was assembled by the Emperor *Theodosius*,

[b] Amb. ep. 4. [c] Anast. c. 38. [d] Cod. Theod. ch. p. 104. [e] Amb. ibid.

ſius, who, after having put the Orthodox in Poſſeſſion of the Churches, which, until this Time, had been held by the *Arians* in the Eaſt, where he reigned, ſummoned all the Biſhops within his Dominions to meet at *Conſtantinople*, in order to deliberate about the moſt proper Means of reſtoring an intire Tranquillity to the Church, rent and diſturbed not only by ſeveral Sects of Heretics, but by the Diviſions that reigned among the Orthodox themſelves, by that eſpecially of *Antioch* the moſt antient of all, which, from that Church, had ſpread all over the Empire, and occaſioned rather an intire Separation, than a Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, the former communicating with *Meletius*, and the latter with *Paulinus*, as I have related above. In this Council many weighty Matters were tranſacted, and ſeveral Canons eſtabliſhed, ſome of which, namely, the Second and Third, deſerve to be taken notice of here. For, by the Second, *the Council renewed and confirmed the ancient Law of the Church, authorized by the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Canons of the Council of* Nice, commanding the Biſhops of each Province to be ordained by thoſe of the ſame Province, and ſuch of the neighbouring Provinces, as they ſhould think fit to call in; directing all Eccleſiaſtical Matters to be ſettled, all Diſputes to be finally decided by a Council compoſed of the Biſhops of the Province, or at leaſt of the Dioceſe, that is, of all the Provinces under the ſame Vicar; and ſtrictly forbidding the Biſhops of one Dioceſe to concern themſelves under any Colour or Pretence whatſoever, with what happeneth in another [f], By this Canon the Privilege, formerly granted to the See of *Rome* by the Council of *Sardica*, was revoked, and all Appeals from the Council of the Dioceſe forbidden. By the Third Canon the See of *Conſtanti-*

which revoketh the Privelege granted to the See of Rome *by the Council of* Sardica.

nople

[f] Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 9. Council. t. 2. p. 947.

nople is declared first in Rank and Dignity after that of *Rome* [g]. Some *Greek* Writers have pretended, that, by this Canon, the Two Sees were declared in every respect equal; but That *Zonaras* himself owneth to be false and groundless [h]. It is to be observed, that the Council of *Constantinople* gave Rank and Honour to that See, but no Jurisdiction. It was to the Council of *Chalcedon* that the Bishops of *Constantinople* owed their Authority and Jurisdiction; for by that Council they were impowered to ordain the Metropolitans of the Dioceses of *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thrace* [i]. The Reasons alleged by *Baronius* to prove the Third Canon of the Council of *Constantinople* suppositious [k]. are quite frivolous; and it is certain beyond all Dispute, that the Bishops of that City maintained ever after the Rank, which the above-mentioned Canon had given them. In a short time the Bishop of *Constantinople*, taking Advantage of that Canon, and of the Deference that is naturally paid to the Bishop of the Imperial City, extended his Jurisdiction over all the neighbouring Provinces, nay, and over the whole Eastern Empire, as we shall observe in the Sequel of this History.

The Council writeth to the Western Bishops.

The Canons of this Council were, without all doubt, sent, according to Custom, to the Western Bishops for their Approbation, probably with the Letter which the Council wrote to them concerning the Heresy of *Apollinaris* [l]. And yet Pope *Leo* the Great writes, that the Third Canon was never notified to the Church of *Rome* [m]; and *Gregory* the Great, that the Canon condemning the *Eudoxians*, which was the first, had never been received at *Rome* [n]: but *Gregory* perhaps meant nothing else, than that the Canon he mentioneth was of no Authority

[g] Concil. ibid. [h] Zon. in can. p. 70, 72. [i] Concil. t. 4. p. 795--798. [k] Bar. ad ann. 181. n. 37, 38. [l] Concil, t. 4. p. 826. [m] Leo, ep. 53. c. 5. [n] Greg. l. 5. ep. 31.

thority at *Rome*. As for *Leo*, it is hard to conceive what he meant by ſaying that the Third Canon was not known to the Church of *Rome*; for he could not but know, that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* held the Second Rank in the Church, and the firſt in the Eaſt, ſince his own Legates, whoſe Conduct he intirely approved of, owned him to have an indiſputable Right to that Rank; nay, *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Dorylæum* in *Phrygia* maintained, that it was with the Conſent and Approbation of *Leo* himſelf that the See of *Conſtantinople* enjoyed that Honour.

The Authority of this Council among the Greeks.

The Authority of this Council hath ever been great among the *Greeks*, who ſtyle it an Oecumenical Council, and had often recourſe to it as ſuch in the Council of *Chalcedon* [o]. The Biſhops of the *Helleſpont* ſpeak of it with the greateſt Reſpect and Reverence, in a Letter they wrote to the Emperor *Leo* [p]. As for the *Latins*, I find a great Diſagreement among the Popes themſelves concerning the Authority of this Council; nay, the greateſt of them all diſagreeth even with himſelf about it. The Legates of Pope *Leo* rejected its Canons, alleging that they had never been inſerted in the Book of the Canons [q]. In like manner the Pope *Simplicius* and *Felix* III. ſpeaking of the Councils which they received, name thoſe only of *Nice*, *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon* [r]. *Gregory* the Great writes, that the Church of *Rome* had neither the Acts nor the Canons of the Council of *Conſtantinople*; that the Condemnation of the *Macedonians* was the only thing done by that Council which they admitted; and that as to other Hereſies condemned there, they rejected them, as having been condemned before by other Councils [s]. But he declareth elſewhere, and often repeateth it, that he received the Four Oecumenical Councils, as he did the Four Goſpels [t],

and the Latins.

[o] Theod. l. 5. c. 9. [p] Conc. t. 4. p. 945. [q] Conc. t. 4. p. 809. Marca de concord. ſacerd. & imp. l. 3. c. 3. [r] Lup. ep. 53. c. 5. [s] Greg. l. 6. ep. 31.

Goſpels[t], naming the Council of *Conſtanople* in the Second Place. In the ſame Manner, and with the ſame Words, were the Four Oecumenical Councils received by *Gelaſius*, and ſeveral Popes before him, as well as by *Martin* I. and ſeveral others after him: ſo that the Council of *Conſtantinople* is, according to ſome Popes, of equal Authority with the Goſpel; according to others, of no Authority at all: nay, it is thus by the ſame Pope at one time extolled, at another time undervalued. Let *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* reconcile theſe Contradictions if they can.

The Popes at Variance among and with themſelves about it.

This Council was aſſembled by the Emperor, and not by Damaſus.

That this Council was aſſembled by the Emperor *Theodoſius*, is affirmed by all the Writers who ſpeak of it[u], nay, and by the Biſhops who compoſed it[w]. And yet *Baronius* has the Aſſurance to aſſert, *as a Thing not to be queſtioned*, that it was convened by *Damaſus*[x], whom none of the Antients have ſo much as once named: and this Aſſertion he foundeth upon the Authority of the univerſally exploded Acts of *Damaſus*; of certain Manuſcripts, which he knoweth very little of, and nobody elſe any thing; and of a Paſſage in the Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council, where it is ſaid, that *Theodoſius* and *Damaſus* oppoſed, with great Firmneſs, the *Macedonian* Hereſy; whence the Annaliſt concludeth, by what Rules of Logic I leave the Reader to find out, that the Council, which condemned the Hereſy of *Macedonius*, was convened by the Authority of *Damaſus*, backed by that of the Emperor[y]. *Chriſtianus Lupus*, more honeſt than *Baronius*, although no leſs attached to the See of *Rome*, ingenuouſly owns, that the Council was aſſembled by the Emperor alone; but adds, that *Damaſus* confirmed it[z]; which is true, if he meaneth no more than that *Damaſus* accepted the Decrees made by the Council; for it was not his, but

[t] Id. l. 1. ep. 24. [u] Theod. l. 5. c. 6. Naz. or. 14. Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7. [w] Ep. ſyn. conc. t. 1. p. 872. [x] Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 20. [y] Id. ib. n. 19. [z] Lup. notæ in can. 1, 2. p. 74.

but the Emperor's, Approbation, that gave them a Sanction; and accordingly they wrote, not to him, but to the Emperor, acquainting him, *by whoſe Command they had been called together*, with the Decrees they had made, and requeſting him to confirm them *with his Seal and Sentence* [a]. This Council conſiſted of an Hundred and Fifty Biſhops, among whom were Thirty-ſix *Macedonians*, whom *Theodoſius* had particularly ſummoned, hoping to reunite them with the Catholics [b]. No Mention is made of Letters or Deputies ſent either by *Damaſus*, or by any of the Weſtern Biſhops; and *Theodoret* aſſureth us in Two different Places [c], that *Theodoſius* only aſſembled the Eaſtern Biſhops. *Meletius* of *Antioch* preſided; for *Gregory* of *Nyſſa* ſtyled him in full Council, *our Father and Head* [d]. Upon his Death (for he died while the Council was ſitting) that Honour was conferred on *Gregory Nazianzen*, appointed by the Emperor and the Council Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* [e]; but he reſigning, ſoon after, his new Dignity, his Succeſſor *Nectarius* was named to preſide in his room [f].

One of the chief Motives that induced *Theodoſius* to aſſemble ſo numerous a Council at *Conſtantinople*, was, to hear what Remedy they could ſuggeſt againſt the Schiſm of the Church of *Antioch*, which cauſed ſuch Jealouſies between the Eaſt and the Weſt, as ſeemed to forbode an imminent Rupture [g]. But before the Fathers of the Council entered upon that important Subject, *Meletius* died; and his Death, which ought to have put an End to the preſent Diſturbances, ſerved only to increaſe them, and engage the contending Parties more warmly in the Diſpute. It had been agreed by *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, that the Survivor ſhould be ſole Biſhop of all the Orthodox

[a] Vide Bar. ad ann. 181. n. 37. [b] Socr. l. 5. c. 8. Soz. l. 7. c. 7. [c] Theod. l. 5. c. 2. 6, & 7. [d] Nyſſ. de Mel. p. 587. [e] Id. ib. p. 589. & Naz. car. 1. p. 27. [f] Vide Lup. t. 1. p. 275. [g] Theod. l. 5. c. 6.

dox at *Antioch* [h]. *Socrates* and *Sozomen* add [i], that Six Presbyters, who it was most likely might be one Day raised to that See, bound themselves by a solemn Oath not to vote for any other, nor to accept themselves the Episcopal Dignity, so long as either of the Two lived. However *Meletius* was no sooner dead, than some of the Prelates present at the Council moved for chusing him a Successor, which occasioned many long and warm Debates. *Gregory Nazianzen*, elected Bishop of *Constantinople* a few Days before, exerted all his Eloquence to divert the Council from a Resolution, which, he said, would prove fatal to the Church, and kindle a Flame, which perhaps it might never be in their Power to extinguish [k]. Several other Prelates, Enemies to Strife and Contention, falling in with *Gregory*, spoke to the same Purpose, exhorting their Collegues, with great Zeal and Eloquence to put an End at last to the unhappy Divisions that had so long rent the Church, by allowing *Paulinus*, already stricken in Years, to govern peaceably the remaining Part of his Life [l]. But the far greater Part were for a new Election, offering no other Reason to recommend such a Step, but that the East, where our Saviour had appeared, ought not to yield to the West [m]. So that the Resolution of giving a Successor to *Meletius* was taken merely out of Pique to the Western Bishops, who, having the Bishop of *Rome* at their Head, had begun to treat their Brethren in the East with great Haughtiness, and assume an Air of Authority that did not become them; but that had been better resented on any other Occasion than on this.

The Disturbances in the Church of Antioch *increased.*

Flavianus ordained Bishop of Antioch.

The Resolution being taken, *Flavianus*, a Presbyter of the Church of *Antioch*, was named by the Council, and, with the Approbation of the Emperor, and of all the *Meletians* at *Antioch*, ordained in that

[h] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 76, 77. [i] Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. [k] Naz. car. 1. p. 24 --26. [l] Id. ib. [m] Id. ib. p. 27.

that City. He is commended by the Writers who lived in or near thoſe Times, as a Man of an exemplary Life, and extraordinary Piety, as a zealous Defender of the Orthodox Faith, and Oppoſer of the *Arian* Hereſy, as a Mirror of every Sacerdotal Virtue; and, barring the Right of *Paulinus*, the moſt worthy and deſerving Perſon the Council could name to ſucceed the great *Meletius* [n]. Theſe, and other like Encomiums, beſtowed upon *Flavianus* by the Writers of thoſe Times, leave no room to doubt but *Socrates* and *Sozomen* were miſinformed in naming him among the Six Preſbyters who took the Oath I have mentioned above; the rather as no notice is taken of ſuch an Oath by his moſt inveterate Enemies, in the many Diſputes that aroſe about his Ordination. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who had been lately preferred to the See of *Conſtantinople*, and had accepted that Dignity with no other View, but to remove all Jealouſies, and reſtore a good Underſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, being ſenſible that the electing of a new Biſhop in the room of *Meletius* would widen the Breach, and obſtruct all poſſible Means of an Accomodation, reſigned his Dignity, and, to the inexpreſſible Grief of his Flock, retired both from the Council and City [o]. In one of his Orations [p], he aſcribeth this Reſolution to the Diviſions that reigned among the Biſhops, declaring that he was quite tired with their conſtant quarrelling and bickering among themſelves, and comparing them to Children at Play; whom to join in their childiſh Diverſions, would be degrading a ſerious Character. Upon the Reſignation of *Gregory*, *Nectarius* was choſen to ſucceed him; but as to the Particulars of his Election they are variouſly related by Authors, and foreign to my purpoſe. He was a Native of *Tarſus* in *Cilicia*, deſcended of an illuſtrious and ſenatorial Family,

Greg. Nazianzen *reſigns the Biſhoprick of* Conſtantinople.

Nectarius *is choſen in his room.*

[n] Vide Theod. l. 5. c. 9. & Cod. Theod. ap. p. 164. [o] Naz. op. 15. Id. or 32.

Family, but at the Time of his Election ſtill a Layman and Prætor of *Conſtantinople*, nay, he had not been baptized [q].

The ſame Year that the Eaſtern Biſhops met at *Conſtantinople*, by the Command of *Theodoſius*, the Weſtern Biſhops met at *Aquileia*, by the Command of *Gratian*. While the latter were yet ſitting, News was brought of the Death of *Meletius*, and at the ſame time they received certain Intelligence of the Reſolution which the Council of *Conſtantinople* had taken of appointing him a Succeſſor. Hereupon having diſpatched the Buſineſs for which they had met, and condemned *Palladius* and *Secundianus*, the only Two *Arian* Biſhops now in the Weſt, they diſpatched ſome Preſbyters into the Eaſt with a Letter to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, wherein, after expreſſing the Joy it had given them to hear that the Orthodox in thoſe Parts were at laſt happily delivered from the Oppreſſion of the *Arians*, they complained of the Hardſhips *Paulinus* had met with, whom they had always acknowleged as lawful Biſhop of *Antioch*, put the Emperor in mind of the Agreement between *Paulinus* and *Meletius*, and concluded with intreating him to aſſemble an Oecumenical Council at *Alexandria*, as the only Means of reſtoring Tranquillity to the Church, and ſettling a perfect Harmony amongſt her Members [r]. Before this Letter reached the Emperor, the Council of *Conſtantinople* was concluded, and the Biſhops returned to their reſpective Sees. However, *Theodoſius* recalled ſome of them, in order to govern himſelf by their Advice in granting or denying the Weſtern Biſhops their Requeſt [s]. But the Election of *Flavianus* being in the mean time known in the Weſt, the Biſhops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, then aſſembled in Council, with *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan* at

The Council of Aquileia *writeth to* Theodoſius *in favour of* Paulinus.

[q] Theodor. l. 5. c. 8. Socrat. l. 5. c. 8. Ruff. l. 2. c. 21. Sozom. lib. 7. c. 8, & 10 [r] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 75-78. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9 [s] Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.

at their Head, wrote a long Letter to *Theodoſius*, complaining of that Election, openly eſpouſing at the ſame time the Cauſe of *Maximus* againſt *Nectarius*, the new Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and threatening to ſeparate themſelves intirely from the Communion of the Eaſtern Biſhops, unleſs *Maximus* was acknowleged lawful Biſhop of that City, or at leaſt an Oecumenical Council was aſſembled to examine the Claims of the Two Competitors, and to confirm with their joint Suffrages the diſputed Dignity to him, who had the beſt [t]. They alſo deſired, in the ſame Letter, to have the Conteſt between *Paulinus* and *Flavianus* decided.

And the Biſhops of Italy *in favour of* Maximus.

Maximus, ſurnamed the *Cynic*, becauſe he had from his Youth profeſſed the Philoſophy, and wore the Habit of that Sect, was a Man of a moſt infamous Character, and had been publicly whipt in *Egypt*, his native Country, and confined to the City of *Oaſis*, for Crimes not fit to be mentioned [u]. Being releaſed from his Baniſhment, he wandered all over the Eaſt, and was every-where equally abhorred and deteſted on account of his matchleſs Impudence and ſcandalous Manners [w]. At laſt he repaired to *Conſtantinople*, where he had not been long, when, by one of the boldeſt Attempts mentioned in Hiſtory, he cauſed himſelf to be inſtalled and ordained Biſhop of that City: for the Doors of the Church being broken open in the Dead of the Night, by a Band of *Egyptian* Mariners, he was placed on the Epiſcopal Chair in the profane Dreſs of a *Cynic*, by ſome Biſhops whom his Friends had ſent out of *Egypt* for that Purpoſe. But the People, and ſome of the Clergy, in the adjoining Houſes, being alarmed at the Noiſe, and crouding to ſee what occaſioned it, *Maximus*, and his unhallowed Crew, thought fit to withdraw, and complete

Who Maximus *was, and how choſen Biſhop of* Conſtantinople.

[t] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 103—107. [u] Naz. or. 23. & car. 148. [w] Id. ib.

Family, but at the Time of his Election still a Layman and Prætor of *Constantinople*, nay, he had not been baptized [q].

The same Year that the Eastern Bishops met at *Constantinople*, by the Command of *Theodosius*, the Western Bishops met at *Aquileia*, by the Command of *Gratian*. While the latter were yet sitting, News was brought of the Death of *Meletius*, and at the same time they received certain Intelligence of the Resolution which the Council of *Constantinople* had taken of appointing him a Successor. Hereupon having dispatched the Business for which they had met, and condemned *Palladius* and *Secundianus*, the only Two *Arian* Bishops now in the West, they dispatched some Presbyters into the East with a Letter to the Emperor *Theodosius*, wherein, after expressing the Joy it had given them to hear that the Orthodox in those Parts were at last happily delivered from the Oppression of the *Arians*, they complained of the Hardships *Paulinus* had met with, whom they had always acknowleged as lawful Bishop of *Antioch*, put the Emperor in mind of the Agreement between *Paulinus* and *Meletius*, and concluded with intreating him to assemble an Oecumenical Council at *Alexandria*, as the only Means of restoring Tranquillity to the Church, and settling a perfect Harmony amongst her Members [r]. Before this Letter reached the Emperor, the Council of *Constantinople* was concluded, and the Bishops returned to their respective Sees. However, *Theodosius* recalled some of them, in order to govern himself by their Advice in granting or denying the Western Bishops their Request [s]. But the Election of *Flavianus* being in the mean time known in the West, the Bishops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, then assembled in Council, with *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan* at

The Council of Aquileia *writeth to* Theodosius *in favour of* Paulinus.

[q] Theodor. l. 5. c. 8. Socrat. l. 5. c. 8. Ruff. l. 2. c. 21. Sozom. lib. 7. c. 8, & 10 [r] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 75--78. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9 [s] Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.

at their Head, wrote a long Letter to *Theodoſius*, complaining of that Election, openly eſpouſing at the ſame time the Cauſe of *Maximus* againſt *Nectarius*, the new Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and threatening to ſeparate themſelves intirely from the Communion of the Eaſtern Biſhops, unleſs *Maximus* was acknowleged lawful Biſhop of that City, or at leaſt an Oecumenical Council was aſſembled to examine the Claims of the Two Competitors, and to confirm with their joint Suffrages the diſputed Dignity to him, who had the beſt [t]. They alſo deſired, in the ſame Letter, to have the Conteſt between *Paulinus* and *Flavianus* decided.

And the Biſhops of Italy *in favour of* Maximus.

Maximus, ſurnamed the *Cynic*, becauſe he had from his Youth profeſſed the Philoſophy, and wore the Habit of that Sect, was a Man of a moſt infamous Character, and had been publicly whipt in *Egypt*, his native Country, and confined to the City of *Oaſis*, for Crimes not fit to be mentioned [u]. Being releaſed from his Baniſhment, he wandered all over the Eaſt, and was every-where equally abhorred and deteſted on account of his matchleſs Impudence and ſcandalous Manners [w]. At laſt he repaired to *Conſtantinople*, where he had not been long, when, by one of the boldeſt Attempts mentioned in Hiſtory, he cauſed himſelf to be inſtalled and ordained Biſhop of that City: for the Doors of the Church being broken open in the Dead of the Night, by a Band of *Egyptian* Mariners, he was placed on the Epiſcopal Chair in the profane Dreſs of a *Cynic*, by ſome Biſhops whom his Friends had ſent out of *Egypt* for that Purpoſe. But the People, and ſome of the Clergy, in the adjoining Houſes, being alarmed at the Noiſe, and crouding to ſee what occaſioned it, *Maximus*, and his unhallowed Crew, thought fit to withdraw, and complete

Who Maximus *was, and how choſen Biſhop of* Conſtantinople.

[t] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 103—107. [u] Naz. or. 23 & car. 148. [w] Id. ib.

complete the Ceremony in a Place better adapted to such a Scene of Profaneness, the House of a Player on the Flute [x]. *Maximus*, thus ordained, in equal Defiance of the Imperial Laws and Canons of the Church, had the Assurance to claim the See of *Constantinople* as his Right, and to protest against the Election of *Gregory Nazianzen*, and likewise of *Nectarius*, who was chosen upon the Resignation of *Gregory*, although they had both been named to that Dignity by the Council of *Constantinople*, that is, by all the Eastern Bishops. But no Regard being had to his Protest, nay, his Ordination being declared null by the Council, and he driven out of the City by the Populace, and rejected with Indignation by the Emperor, he had recourse to the Bishops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, then assembled in Council, with *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan* at their Head, as I have observed above. These giving an intire Credit to the Accounts of the lying and deceitful *Cynic*, as they were quite unacquainted with what had passed in the East, not only admitted him to their Communion, but, without farther Inquiry or Examination, acknowleged him for lawful Bishop of *Constantinople*, and wrote the above-mentioned Letter to *Theodosius* in his Behalf [y]. We must not confound this Council with that of *Aquileia*, as I find most Writers have done: for the latter was composed of almost all the Western Bishops, under *Valerian* Bishop of the Place; whereas the Council I am now speaking of, consisted only of the Bishops of the Vicariate of *Italy*, under the Bishop of *Milan* their Metropolitan. It is surprizing, that *Ambrose*, and the other Bishops of that Council, should not have been better informed with respect to the Ordination of *Maximus*, since *Acholius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, with Five other Bishops of *Macedon*, had, at least a Year before, transmitted to *Damasus*

He is acknowlegea by Ambrose, *and the* Italian *Bishops.*

[x] Id. car. 1. p. 14, 15. & or. 28.

[y] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104——107.

Damasus a minute Account of it, agreeing in every Particular with that which I have given above from *Gregory Nazianzen*[z]. The Letter from the Council caused no small Surprize in *Theodosius*: he was sensible they had suffered themselves to be grosly imposed upon; but, not judging it necessary to undeceive them, he only told them, in his Answer to their Letter, that the Reasons they alleged did not seem sufficient to him for assembling an Oecumenical Council, and giving so much Trouble to the Prelates of the Church; that they were not to concern themselves with what happened in the East, nor remove the Bounds, that had been wisely placed by their Forefathers between the East and the West; and that, as to the Affair of *Maximus*, by espousing his Cause they had betrayed either an unwarrantable Animosity against the Orientals, or an inexcusable Credulity in giving Credit to false and groundless Reports[a]. *The Emperor's Answer to their Letter.*

Upon the Receipt of this Letter, the *Italian* Bishops, finding *Theodosius* no-ways disposed to assemble an Oecumenical Council, applied to *Gratian*, who not only granted them Leave to meet at *Rome*, the Place they chose, but dispatched Letters to all the Bishops both in the East and West, giving them Notice of the Time and Place, in which the Council was to be held, and inviting them to it[b]. But of all the Eastern Bishops, Two only complied with this Invitation; *viz.* *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Salamis* in the Island of *Cyprus*, and *Paulinus*, whom all the West acknowleged for lawful Bishop of *Antioch*. The Western Bishops were all present, either in Person, or by their Deputies: and *Damasus* presided[c]. But, as to the Transactions of this great Assembly, we are almost intirely in the Dark; for all we know *A Council of all the Western Bishops assembled at Rome.*

of

[z] Vide Holsten. coll. vet. Rom. eccles. monument. p. 37—40.
[a] Cod. Theod. ap. p. 99–101. [b] Hier. ep. 27. Theod. l. 5. c. 9. [c] Hier. ep. 16. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. Ambr. ep. 22.

of them is, that they unanimouſly agreed not to communicate with *Flavianus*, the new Biſhop of *Antioch*, nor with *Diodorus* of *Tarſus*, or *Acacius* of *Bœrea*, who had been chiefly inſtrumental in his Promotion; that they condemned the Hereſy of *Apollinaris*; and that, at the Requeſt of *Damaſus*, a Confeſſion of Faith was drawn up by *Jerom*, and approved by the Council, which the *Apollinariſts* were to ſign, upon their being re-admitted to the Communion of the Church [d]. As for *Maximus*, they ſeem to have abandoned his Cauſe, being, in all Likelihood, undeceived, with reſpect to his Ordination, by *Acolius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, and St. *Jerom*, who aſſiſted at the Council, and could not be Strangers to the Character of *Maximus*, nor unacquainted with the ſcandalous Methods by which he had attained the Epiſcopal Dignity.

The Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt increaſed.

The Reſolution they took not to communicate with *Flavianus*, whoſe Election, although imprudently made, was undoubtedly Canonical, and had been approved and confirmed by the Oecumenical Council of *Conſtantinople*, not only increaſed the Jealouſies and Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, but occaſioned a great Diſagreement, and endleſs Quarrels, amongſt the Eaſtern Biſhops themſelves. For thoſe, who acknowleged *Paulinus*, *viz.* the Biſhops of *Egypt*, of the Iſland of *Cyprus*, of *Arabia*, inſiſted upon the Depoſition of *Flavianus* [e]. *Neſtorius* mentioneth ſome Letters, written by the Biſhops of *Egypt*, againſt *Flavianus*, with great Virulency, and a *tyrannical Spirit*, to uſe his Expreſſion [f]. On the other hand, the Biſhops of *Syria*, of *Palæſtine*, of *Phœnicia*, *Armenia*, *Cappadocia*, *Galatia*, *Pontus*, *Aſia*, and *Thrace*, not only maintained with equal Warmth, the Election of *Flavianus*, but began to treat

[d] Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Holſt. coll. t. 2. p. 37. Ruf. de orig. lib. adulter. p. 197. [e] Theodor. l. 5. c. 23. Socr. l. 5 c. 10.
[f] Mercat. opera, t. 2. p. 86. n. 5.

treat their Brethren in the Eaſt, who had joined the Weſtern Biſhops againſt them, as Schiſmatics, as Betrayers of their Truſt, as Tranſgreſſors of the Canons of *Nice*, commanding the Elections and Ordinations of each Province to be made and performed by the Biſhops of the ſame Province, and all Diſputes concerning them to be finally decided in the Place where they had begun g. This Schiſm occaſioned great Confuſion in the Church, which continued until the Year 398, when *Chryſoſtom*, after having, with indefatigable Pains, long laboured in vain to bring about an Accommodation between the Eaſt and the Weſt, had at laſt, ſoon after his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, the Satisfaction of ſeeing his pious Endeavours crowned with Succeſs, as I ſhall relate in a more proper Place.

No Regard paid by the Eaſtern Biſhops to the Judgment of the Pope.

From this whole Account it is manifeſt, as the Reader muſt have obſerved, that the Orientals paid no manner of Regard either to the Judgment of the Biſhop of *Rome*, or to that of the whole Body of the Weſtern Biſhops, aſſembled in Council under him. For although they well knew the Biſhop of *Rome*, and his Collegues in the Weſt, to be warmly engaged in favour of *Paulinus*, yet they refuſed to acknowlege him, even after the Death of *Meletius*; and therefore raiſed *Flavianus* to the See of *Antioch*, in the room of *Meletius*, and confirmed that Election in an Oecumenical Council. The Weſtern Biſhops exclaimed againſt it, deſiring it might be referred to the Deciſion of a general Council. But not even to that Demand would the Orientals agree, thinking, as they declared in their Anſwer, that there was no Occaſion for a Council, ſince *Flavianus* had been choſen and ordained by the Biſhops of the Dioceſe, which was all the Canons of *Nice* required. They therefore exhorted them to diveſt themſelves of all Prejudices, to ſacrifice all private Affections to the Peace and Unity of the Church, and to put an End

g Soz. l. 7. c. 11. Theodor. l. 5. c. 23.

to the present, and prevent all future Disputes, by approving, with their joint Suffrages, and Election which had been approved and confirmed by an Oecumenical Council [h].

The Custom of appointing Vicars introduced by Damasus, *and on what Occasion.*

To return to *Damasus:* He was the first who introduced the Custom, which his Successors took care to improve, of conferring on certain Bishops the Title of their Vicars, pretending thereby to impart to them an extraordinary Power, enabling them to perform several things, which they could not perform in virtue of their own. *Acholius*, Bishop of *Thessalonica*, was the first who enjoyed this Title, being, by *Damasus*, appointed his Vicar in *East Illyricum*, on the following Occasion: *Illyricum*, comprising all antient *Greece*, and many Provinces on the *Danube*, whereof *Sirmium* was the Capital, had, ever since the Time of *Constantine*, belonged to the Western Empire: But, in the Year 379, *Dacia* and *Greece* were, by *Gratian*, disjoined from the more Westerly Provinces, and added, in favour of *Theodosius*, to the Eastern Empire, being known by the Name of *East Illyricum*, whereof *Thessalonica*, the Metropolis of *Macedon*, was the chief City. The Bishops of *Rome*, as presiding in the Metropolis of the Empire, had begun to claim a kind of Jurisdiction, or Inspection in Ecclesiastical Matters, over all the Provinces of the Western Empire; which was the first great Step by which they ascended to the Supremacy they afterwards claimed and established.

The Bishop of Thessalonica *appointed the Pope's Vicar in* East Illyricum.

This *Damasus* was unwilling to resign with respect to *Illyricum*, even after that Country was dismembered from the Western, and added to the Eastern Empire. In order therefore to maintain his Claim, he appointed *Acholius*, Bishop of *Thessalonica*, to act in his stead, vesting in him the Power which he pretended to have over those Provinces. Upon the Death of *Acholius*, he conferred the same Dignity on his Successor *Anysius*, as did the following Popes on the succeeding Bishops

[h] Theodor. l. 5. c. 8.

Biſhops of *Theſſalonica*, who, by thus ſupporting the Pretenſions of *Rome*, became the firſt Biſhops, and, in a manner, the Patriarchs, of *Eaſt Illyricum*; for they are ſometimes diſtinguiſhed with that Title. This, however, was not done without Oppoſition, the other Metropolitans not readily acknowleging for their Superior one who, until that time, had been their Equal [i]. *Syricius*, who ſucceeded *Damaſus*, inlarging the Power claimed by his Predeceſſor, decreed, that no Biſhop ſhould be ordained in *Eaſt Illyricum* without the Conſent and Approbation of the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* [k]. But it was ſome time before this Decree took place. Pope *Innocent* I. writes, that his Predeceſſors committed to the Care of *Acholius*, *Achaia*, *Theſſaly*, the Two *Epiruſes*, *Candia*, the Two *Dacias*, *Mæſia*, *Dardania*, and *Prævalitana*, now Part of *Albania*, impowering him to judge and decide the Controverſies that might ariſe there, and appointing him to be *the firſt among the Primates, without prejudicing the Primacy of thoſe Churches* [l]. Thus were the Biſhops of *Theſſalonica* firſt appointed Vicars or Vicegerents of the Biſhops of *Rome*, probably in the Year 382, for in that Year *Acholius* aſſiſted at the Council of *Rome*, and it was, in all Likelihood, on that Occaſion that *Damaſus* veſted him with this new Dignity. The Contrivance of *Damaſus* was notably improved by his Succeſſors, who, in order to extend and inlarge their Authority, conferred the Title of their Vicars, and the pretended Power annexed to it, on the moſt eminent Prelates of other Provinces and Kingdoms, engaging them thereby to depend upon them, and to promote the Authority of their See, to the utter Suppreſſion of the antient Rights and Liberties both of Biſhops and Synods. This Dignity was for the moſt part annexed to certain

The Inſtitution of Vicars improved by the ſucceeding Popes.

[i] Vide Chriſt. Lup. de Rom Apell. p. 627, 628. [k] Coll. Rom. Holſten. p. 43. [l] Ibid. p. 48, 49.

tain Sees, but sometimes conferred on particular Persons. Thus was *Austin* appointed the Pope's Vicar in *England*, *Boniface* in *Germany*; and both, in virtue of the Power which they pretended to have been imparted to them with that Title, usurped and exercised an Authority above that of Metropolitans. The Institution of Vicars was, by the succeeding Popes, improved into that of Legates, or, to use *De Marca*'s Expression, the latter Institution was grafted on the former [m]. The Legates were vested with a far greater Power than the Vicars, or, as Pope *Leo* expresseth it, *were admitted to a far greater Share of his Care, although not to the Plenitude of his Power* [n]. They were sent on proper Occasions into all Countries, and never failed exerting, to the utmost Stretch, their boasted Power, oppressing, in virtue of their paramount Authority, the Clergy as well as the People, and extorting from both large Sums, to support the Pomp and Luxury in which they lived.

Legates vested with greater Power than Vicars.

The Custom of appointing Vicars and Legates may well be alleged as a remarkable Instance of the Craft and Policy of the Popes, since, of all the Methods they ever devised (and many they have devised) to extend and establish their Power, none hath better answered their ambitious Views. But how *Bellarmine* could lay so much Stress upon it as he doth [o], to prove, that the Pope hath, by *Divine Right*, a sovereign Authority and Jurisdiction over all the Churches of the Earth, is unconceivable. For it is certain, beyond all Dispute, that such a Custom had never been heard of until the Time of *Damasus*, that is, until the Latter-end of the Fourth Century, when it was first introduced, upon the dismembering of *East Illyricum*, by *Gratian*, from the Western Empire. *Damasus* did not even then claim that sovereign and unlimited Power, with which *Bellarmine* is

The sending Legates no Proof of the Pope's universal Jurisdiction.

[m] De Marc. concord. sacerd. & imp. l. 6. c. 5. [n] Leo, ep. 48. [o] Bell. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 20.

is pleaſed to veſt him, but only a kind of Inſpection over the Provinces of the Weſtern Empire, as Biſhop of the firſt See. And here I cannot help obſerving the Diſingenuity of *Bellarmine*, who, in ſpeaking of this Inſtitution, expreſſeth himſelf thus: Leo *appointed* Anaſtaſius *Biſhop of* Theſſalonica *his Vicar in the Eaſt, in the ſame manner as the Predeceſſors of* Anaſtaſius *had been Vicars to the Predeceſſors of* Leo [r]. From theſe Words every Reader would naturally conclude, and *Bellarmine* deſigns they ſhould, that the Biſhops of *Theſſalonica* had been the Pope's Vicars from the Beginning, or Time out of Mind; whereas it is certain, that this Inſtitution had taken place but a few Years before. Pope *Leo* I. in conferring on *Anaſtaſius* the *Vicariate Dignity of his See*, as he ſtyleth it, declared, that he followed therein the Example of his Predeceſſor *Syricius* [s], *who firſt appointed* Anyſius *to act in his ſtead*. But he was doubly miſtaken; for theſe Vicars were firſt inſtituted, as is notorious, by *Damaſus*, and not by *Syricius*; and it was not by *Syricius*, but by *Damaſus*, that *Anyſius* was veſted with that Dignity [t]. The Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* is ſtyled, by the antient Writers, the Pope's Vicar in *Eaſt Illyricum*, which is manifeſtly confining his Vicariate Juriſdiction to that Diſtrict; but *Bellarmine* extendeth it at once all over the Eaſt, by diſtinguiſhing him with the Title of *the Pope's Vicar for the Eaſt* [u]. But how little Regard was paid to the Pope's Authority in the Eaſt, I have ſufficiently ſhewn above.

The Diſingenuity of Bellarmine.

I find nothing elſe in the antient Writers concerning *Damaſus* worthy of notice, beſides his generouſly undertaking the Defence of *Symmachus*, who, being Præfect of *Rome* in 384, the laſt Year of *Damaſus*'s Life, and a *ſworn* Enemy to the Chriſtians, was falſly accuſed to the Emperor, as if he had with great Cruelty

[r] Id. ib. [s] Coll. Rom. Holſten. p. 145. [t] Ibid. p. 46—49.
[u] Bell. ib.

Cruelty persecuted and oppressed them. But *Damasus* had the Generosity to take his Part, and clear him, by a Letter he wrote to the Emperor, from that Charge [w]. This was one of the last Actions of *Damasus*'s Life; for he died this Year on the 10th or 11th of *December*, being then in the Eightieth Year of his Age, after he had governed the Church of *Rome* for the Space of Eighteen Years, and about two Months [x]. He was buried, according to *Anastasius* [y], near his Mother and Sister, in a Church which he had built at the Catacombs, on the Way to *Ardea*; whence that Place, although Part of the Cœmetery of *Callixtus*, is by some called the Cœmetery of *Damasus* [z]. He proposed at first being buried near the Remains of St. *Sixtus*, and his Companions; but afterwards changed his Mind, lest he should disturb the Ashes of the Saints [a]. He caused the Church of St. *Laurence*, near the Theatre of *Pompey*, probably that which his Father and he himself had formerly served, to be rebuilt, inlarged, and imbellished; whence it is still known by the joint Titles of St. *Laurence* and *Damasus* [b]. In that Church his Body is worshipped to this Day. But how or when it was removed thither, nobody knoweth [c]. Several Decrees are ascribed to *Damasus* by *Gratian*, *Ivo* of *Chartres*, *Anastasius*, and others, but all evidently forged by some Impostor blindly addicted to the See of *Rome*, and quite unacquainted with the Discipline of the Church in the Fourth Century. In one of them a Canon is quoted from the Council of *Nice*, forbidding the Laity to eat or drink of any thing that was *offered to the holy Priests*, because none but the *Jewish* Priests were allowed to eat of the Bread that was offered on the Altar. We know of no such Canon;

Damasus dies.

The Decrees ascribed to him supposititious.

[w] Sym. l. 10. ep. 34. [x] Hier. vir. ill. c. 103. [y] Anast. c. 38. [z] Aring. l. 3. c. 12. n. 16. [a] Vide Bar. in app. ann. 384. n. 25. [b] Front. cal. p. 50. Bar. ad ann. 384. n. 16. [c] Aring. l. 3. c. 12.

Canon; and beſides, it is not at all probable, that the Council of *Nice* would have reſtrained the Clergy from ſharing at leaſt with the Poor what was offered them. In another of theſe Decrees the Paying of Tythes is commanded, on pain of Excommunication; whereas it might be eaſily made appear, that, in the Fourth Century, the Offerings deſtined for the Maintenance of the Clergy were ſtill voluntary. Another Decree ſuppoſes, that, by an antient Cuſtom, all Metropolitans ſwore Fealty to the Apoſtolic See, and could ordain no Biſhops until they had received the Pall from *Rome*. For the ſake of this, *Baronius* admitteth all the reſt: but of ſuch a Cuſtom not the leaſt Mention, or diſtant Hint, is to be met with in any antient Writer.

Damaſus is ranked by *Jerom*[d] among the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, on account of the many ſmall Pieces he wrote, chiefly in Verſe; for he had a particular Genius for Poetry, and was no deſpicable Poet, if ſome Compoſitions aſcribed to him were truly his. He wrote ſeveral Books, both in Proſe and Verſe, in Commendation of Virginity; but neither that, nor any of his other Works, hath reached our Times, beſides ſome Letters, and a few Epitaphs, Inſcriptions, and Epigrams, which have been carefully collected by *Baronius*[e], although it may be juſtly queſtioned whether the ſeveral Pieces aſcribed to him by that Writer were written by him. A ſhort Hiſtory of the firſt Popes, ſtyled, *The Pontifical of* Damaſus, and publiſhed together with the Councils, hath long paſſed for the Work of *Damaſus*; but now even *Baronius* owneth it not to be his; and moſt Critics are of Opinion, that it was wrote after the Time of *Gregory the Great*; nay, ſome aſcribe it to *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, who flouriſhed in the Ninth Century[f]. As for his Letters, thoſe to *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, to *Stephen*,

His Writings in Proſe and Verſe.

[d] Hier. vir. ill. c. 103. [e] Bar. ad ann. 384. n. 21. [f] Bolland. propyl. p. 59.

Stephen, styled *Archbishop of the Council of* Mauritania, to *Prosper* Primate of *Numidia*, to the Bishops of *Italy*, are all spurious, as well as the Letters to which some of them are Answers, and supposed to have been forged by that notorious Impostor *Isidorus Mercator* [g]. His genuine Letters are the Two, that are to be found among the Works of *Jerom*, to whom they were written; Two to *Acholius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, published by *Holstenius* in his *Collection of the antient Monuments of the Church of* Rome [h]; a Letter of great Length to *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, whereof the chief Heads are set down by *Theodoret* in his History, as are likewise those of his Letter to the Orientals concerning *Timotheus*, the favourite Disciple of *Apollinaris*. Several Letters from the Councils, that were held in *Rome* in his Time, and at which he presided, are still extant, and may well be ascribed to him. The Two Letters to *Jerom* are well worth perusing, being written in a pure, easy, and elegant Style, and with a great deal of Spirit, Vivacity, and even Gaiety, although *Damasus* was then much advanced in Years, and overburdened with Cares and Business [i]. In one of them he declares, that his only Delight was to read the Scriptures, and that all other Books, however well written, gave him rather Disgust than Pleasure. *Jerom* returned to *Rome* from the East in 382, with *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Salamis*, and *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, to assist at the Council held there. The other Two returned to their Sees; but *Jerom* continued at *Rome*, being kept there by *Damasus*, who employed him in answering the Letters he received from the Councils of several Churches applying to him for his Advice [k]. *Damasus*, taken with his Learning and Erudition, and chiefly with the Knowlege he had of the Scripture, had long before

Jerom *kept at* Rome, *and employed by him.*

[g] Id. ib. & Du Pin. Biblioth. p. 459. [h] Holsten. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 37, & 180. [i] Hier. ep. 124, & 144. [k] Id. ep. 11. Ruff. de Orig. p. 197.

fore lived in great Intimacy with him, and upon his leaving *Rome* wrote frequent Letters to him, not thinking it beneath the Rank he held in the Church to conſult him as his Maſter about the true Meaning of ſome difficult Paſſages in holy Writ[l]. Thus in one of his Letters he deſireth him to explain the Parable of the Prodigal Son[m], and in another to interpret the Word *Hoſanna*, which he ſaith was differently interpreted by different Writers, who ſeemed to contradict each other[n]. In Compliance with this Reſpect, *Jerom* wrote the Piece on that Subject, which is ſtill extant. It was likewiſe at the Deſire of *Damaſus* that he corrected the *Latin* Verſion of the New Teſtament, and reviſed at *Rome* the *Latin* Verſion of the Pſalms, comparing it with the *Greek* Text of the *Septuagint*. But as to the Letter with which *Damaſus* is ſuppoſed to have encouraged him to undertake that Work, it is evidently ſuppoſititious, and altogether unworthy of him.

Anaſtaſius aſcribeth to *Damaſus* the Cuſtom of Singing, inſtead of Reading, the Pſalms at Divine Service[o]. But it is manifeſt from *Auſtin*, that this Practice was brought from the Eaſt, and firſt complied with by the Church of *Milan*[p], in the Year 386, that is, Two Years after the Death of *Damaſus*. So long as *Damaſus* lived, *Jerom* continued at *Rome*; but as, by his Learning and exemplary Life, he was an Eye-ſore to the lewd, ignorant, and haughty Clergy of *Rome*, or, as he ſtyles them, *the Senate of Phariſees*[q], he thought it adviſeable to abandon the City upon the Death of his great Friend and Protector, and retire to *Jeruſalem*, hoping to find there that Quiet and Tranquillity which he deſpaired of being able to enjoy while he dwelt with *the Scarlet Whore*[r], that is, while he lived at *Rome*. As for the Character of *Damaſus*; *Jerom* ſtyleth him, *a Virgin Doctor*[r]. *Pſalmody falſly aſcribed to him.* *His Character.*

[l] Hier. ep. 144. [m] Id. ep. 146. [n] Id. ep. 144. [o] Anaſt. c. 38. [p] Aug. confeſſ. l. 9. c. 7. [q] Hier. in præf. verſion. Dyd. de Spir. Sanct. [r] Id. ib.

Doctor of the Virgin Church; and, in his Letter to *Eustochium*, *a Man of great Excellence*. *Theodoret* commendeth him as a Man of an holy Life, as one who declined no Fatigue or Labour to support and maintain the Doctrine of the Apostles, and who struck the *Arians* with Terror, although he attacked them at a Distance[s]. Elsewhere he calleth him the *famous Damasus*[t], and placeth him at the Head of the most celebrated Teachers of Truth, who, until his Time, had appeared in the West[u]. That *Greek* Writer could not be biassed in his favour, although *Jerom* perhaps was. The Orientals declared, in 431, that they followed the Example of *Damasus*, and other Persons eminent for Learning[w]; and the Council of *Chalcedon*, speaking of his Letter to *Paulinus* of *Antioch*, styleth him the Honour and Glory of *Rome* for Piety and Justice[x]. The Church of *Rome* honoureth him as a Saint, and his Festival is kept in some Places on the 10th, in others on the 11th of *December*. But, after all, that he got the Pontificate by the most horrible Violence and Bloodshed; that he lived in great State; that he had frequent and grand Entertainments; that he kept a Table, which, in Sumptuousness, vied with the Tables of the Emperors themselves; and all this at the Expence of the *Roman* Ladies, whose generous Contributions might have been applied to better Uses, is affirmed by cotemporary and unexceptionable Writers. It is likewise manifest from the Letters of *Jerom*, that in his Time the Discipline of the Church was greatly relaxed; that the Observance of the primitive Canons was almost utterly neglected; and that Luxury, Ignorance, and Debauchery, universally prevailed among the Ecclesiastics at *Rome*. And this Charge against hisClergy, in some degree, recoileth upon him, since he appeareth to have carried the Papal Authority

[s] Theod. l. 5. c. 2. & l. 4. c. 27. [t] Id. ep. 144. [u] Ep. 145.
[w] Concil. t. 3. p. 740. [x] Concil. t. 4. p. 82.

rity farther than any of his Predeceſſors, and therefore might have reſtrained and corrected them. Whether his Sanctity may not from all this be juſtly queſtioned, notwithſtanding the favourable Teſtimony of ſome antient Writers, I leave the Reader to judge.

VALENTINIAN, THEODOSIUS, **SYRICIUS,** ARCADIUS, HONORIUS.

Thirty-ſeventh BISHOP *of* Rome.

SYRICIUS, the Succeſſor of *Damaſus*, according to the Pontificals, and ſome antient Monuments quoted and received by *Baronius* [o], was a Native of *Rome*, the Son of one *Tiburtius*, had been firſt Reader, and afterwards Deacon, under *Liberius*, and, upon his Death, had zealouſly eſpouſed the Cauſe of *Damaſus* againſt *Urſinus* and his Party. *Damaſus* being dead, he was choſen in his room by the unanimous Acclamations of the whole *Roman* People, being at that time Preſbyter of the Church known by the Title of *the Paſtor*, perhaps the moſt antient Church in *Rome* [p]. *Urſinus*, who was ſtill alive, did not fail, upon the Vacancy of the See, to revive his former Claim, but he was rejected with Scorn and Indignation. *Valentinian* the younger, who then reigned in *Italy* under the Direction of his Mother *Juſtina*, received the News of this Election with great Joy; and, concluding, from the Unanimity of the Electors, the Worth and Merit of the Perſon elected, confirmed *Syricius* in his new Dignity, by a Reſcript dated the 23d of *February*, and directed to *Pinianus*, at that Time either Præfect or Vicar of *Rome* [q] (A). The

Year of Chriſt 384.

[o] Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. Anaſt. c. 27. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32.
[p] Vide Bar. ad ann. 385. n. 5. [q] Id. ib. n. 6.

(A) *Damaſus* died on the 10th or 11th of *December* 384, as I have

His Answer to Himerius Bishop of Tarragon.

The first Thing I read of *Syricius* is his answering a Letter or Relation which *Himerius*, Bishop of *Tarragon* in *Spain*, had sent to *Damasus* by *Bassianus*, a Presbyter of that Church, requiring the Advice of the Church of *Rome* concerning some Points of Discipline, and certain Abuses that prevailed in *Spain*. *Damasus* being dead before the Arrival of *Bassianus*, *Syricius*, who had succeeded him, caused this Relation or Letter to be read, and carefully examined, in an Assembly of his Brethren, that is, perhaps, of the Bishops who had assisted at his Ordination; and, having maturely weighed and considered every Article, he first acquainted *Himerius* with his Promotion, and then returned to each the following Answers [r]. The First was concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, which was by some Bishops of *Spain* rejected as null and invalid, when conferred by an *Arian* Minister. In Opposition to them, *Syricius* alleges the Authority of *Liberius*, and of the Council of *Nice*, the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and that of all other Churches both in the East and the West [s]. *Isidorus* of *Seville* taketh particular notice of this Point of Discipline, which he saith was established by the Letter of *Syricius* [t]. By the Second Article he forbids the Sacrament of Baptism to be administered at *Christmas*, or the *Epiphany*, on the Feasts of the Apostles or Martyrs, or at any other Time but at *Easter*, and during the *Pentecost* of that Festival, meaning, in all Likelihood, all *Easter* time, or the Fifty

[r] Concil. t. 1. p. 69, 689—691. [s] Ib. p. 689. [t] Isid. ser. c. 3.

have related above, and *Syricius* was chosen the same Year, as we read in the Chronicle of *Prosper*. *Anastasius* therefore, and the Author of the Pontifical published by *Bollandus*, as well as *Baronius*, were certainly mistaken in affirming, upon what Grounds I know not, that, upon the Death of *Damasus*, the See remained vacant for the Space of 31 or 36 Days (1).

(1) Anast. p. 21. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. Bar. ib. n. 5.

Fifty Days between *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*, or *Whitſuntide*, for ſuch, addeth he, is the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and of all other Churches. From this Rule, however, he excepteth Children, and all Perſons, who are any ways in Danger [u]. By the Third Article he forbiddeth granting the Grace of Reconciliation to Apoſtates, that is, forgiving and readmitting them to the Communion of the Church, except at the Point of Death [w]. By the Fourth, a Woman, who, being betrothed to one Man, hath received the Prieſt's Bleſſing to marry him, is debarred from marrying another. The Fifth Article commandeth all Perſons, who, being guilty of a Crime, have performed Penance for it, to be treated as the Apoſtates, if they relapſe into the ſame Crime; and the Sixth, all religious Perſons, whether Men or Women, guilty of Fornication, to be dealt with in the ſame Manner, and, moreover, to be excluded from partaking of the ſacred Myſteries, that is, of the Euchariſt, except at the Point of Death [x]. How different is the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome* from that of the ſame Church in the Fourth Century! which was perhaps even too ſevere.

Syricius, by the Seventh Article of his Letter, obligeth all Prieſts and Deacons to obſerve Celibacy; and as ſome had not paid due Obedience to that Command of the Church, he alloweth thoſe who ſhould acknowledge their Fault, and plead Ignorance, to continue in their Rank, although without Hopes of riſing: but as for thoſe who ſhould preſume to defend this Abuſe as lawful, he declareth them depoſed and degraded from the Rank they held in the Church [y]. Pope *Innocent* I. writing to *Exuperius* Biſhop of *Toulouſe*, quoteth and tranſcribeth great Part of this Article [z]. The Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Articles deſcribe at length the

Prieſts and Deacons obliged to obſerve Celibacy.

Life

[u] Con. ib. [w] Ib. p. 690. [x] Ibid. [y] Ib. p. 689, 690.
[z] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.

His Answer to Himerius *Bishop of* Tarragon.

The first Thing I read of *Syricius* is his answering a Letter or Relation which *Himerius*, Bishop of *Tarragon* in *Spain*, had sent to *Damasus* by *Bassianus*, a Presbyter of that Church, requiring the Advice of the Church of *Rome* concerning some Points of Discipline, and certain Abuses that prevailed in *Spain*. *Damasus* being dead before the Arrival of *Bassianus*, *Syricius*, who had succeeded him, caused this Relation or Letter to be read, and carefully examined, in an Assembly of his Brethren, that is, perhaps, of the Bishops who had assisted at his Ordination; and, having maturely weighed and considered every Article, he first acquainted *Himerius* with his Promotion, and then returned to each the following Answers [r]. The First was concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, which was by some Bishops of *Spain* rejected as null and invalid, when conferred by an *Arian* Minister. In Opposition to them, *Syricius* alleges the Authority of *Liberius*, and of the Council of *Nice*, the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and that of all other Churches both in the East and the West [s]. *Isidorus* of *Seville* taketh particular notice of this Point of Discipline, which he saith was established by the Letter of *Syricius* [t]. By the Second Article he forbids the Sacrament of Baptism to be administered at *Christmas*, or the *Epiphany*, on the Feasts of the Apostles or Martyrs, or at any other Time but at *Easter*, and during the *Pentecost* of that Festival, meaning, in all Likelihood, all *Easter* time, or the Fifty

[r] Concil. t. 1. p. 69, 689—691. [s] Ib. p. 689. [t] Isid. ser. c. 3.

have related above, and *Syricius* was chosen the same Year, as we read in the Chronicle of *Prosper*. *Anastasius* therefore, and the Author of the Pontifical published by *Bollandus*, as well as *Baronius*, were certainly mistaken in affirming, upon what Grounds I know not, that, upon the Death of *Damasus*, the See remained vacant for the Space of 31 or 36 Days (1).

(1) Anast. p. 21. Boll. Apr. t. 1. p. 32. Bar. ib. n. 5.

Fifty Days between *Eaſter* and *Pentecoſt*, or *Whitſuntide*, for ſuch, addeth he, is the Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and of all other Churches. From this Rule, however, he excepteth Children, and all Perſons, who are any ways in Danger [u]. By the Third Article he forbiddeth granting the Grace of Reconciliation to Apoſtates, that is, forgiving and readmitting them to the Communion of the Church, except at the Point of Death [w]. By the Fourth, a Woman, who, being betrothed to one Man, hath received the Prieſt's Bleſſing to marry him, is debarred from marrying another. The Fifth Article commandeth all Perſons, who, being guilty of a Crime, have performed Penance for it, to be treated as the Apoſtates, if they relapſe into the ſame Crime; and the Sixth, all religious Perſons, whether Men or Women, guilty of Fornication, to be dealt with in the ſame Manner, and, moreover, to be excluded from partaking of the ſacred Myſteries, that is, of the Euchariſt, except at the Point of Death [x]. How different is the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome* from that of the ſame Church in the Fourth Century! which was perhaps even too ſevere.

Syricius, by the Seventh Article of his Letter, obligeth all Prieſts and Deacons to obſerve Celibacy; and as ſome had not paid due Obedience to that Command of the Church, he alloweth thoſe who ſhould acknowledge their Fault, and plead Ignorance, to continue in their Rank, although without Hopes of riſing: but as for thoſe who ſhould preſume to defend this Abuſe as lawful, he declareth them depoſed and degraded from the Rank they held in the Church [y]. Pope *Innocent* I. writing to *Exuperius* Biſhop of *Toulouſe*, quoteth and tranſcribeth great Part of this Article [z]. The Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Articles deſcribe at length the

Prieſts and Deacons obliged to obſerve Celibacy.

Life

[u] Con. ib. [w] Ib. p. 690. [x] Ibid. [y] Ib. p. 689, 690.
[z] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756.

Life which those ought to have led, who are raised by the Clergy and People to the Episcopal Dignity, and the Steps or Degrees by which they should ascend to it. They ought first to have been Readers; at the Age of Thirty, Acolytes, Subdeacons, and Deacons; Five Years after, Presbyters; and in that Degree they were to continue Ten Years, before they could be chosen Bishops. Those who had been married to Two Wives, or to a Widow, are absolutely excluded from ever sitting in the Episcopal See. Even the Lectors are forbidden, on pain of Deposition, to marry twice, or to marry a Widow[a]. These, and several other less important Regulations, *Syricius* delivereth as general Rules to be inviolably observed by all Churches, often declaring, that those who do not readily comply with them, shall be separated from his Communion by the Sentence of a Synod, and strictly injoining the chief Prelates of each Province to take care they be punctually observed within the Bounds of their respective Jurisdictions, on Pain of being deposed, and treated as they deserve. He therefore desireth *Himerius* to notify his Letter, not only to all the Bishops of his Diocese or Province, but likewise to those of *Carthagena*, *Bætica*, *Lusitania*, *Galicia*, and to all the neighbouring Bishops, meaning perhaps those of *Gaul*; for *Innocent* I. supposes the Decrees of his Predecessor *Syricius* to be known to *Exuperius* of *Toulouse*[b]; and in all Likelihood they were so to others in that Country.

This Letter is the First of all the Decretals acknowledged, by the Learned, to be genuine, and likewise the First in all the antient Collections of the Canons of the *Latin* Church. It is quoted by *Innocent* I. and *Isidore* of *Seville*, and is the only Letter of the many ascribed to *Syricius*, that *Dionysius Exiguus* hath inserted in his Collection. It is to be found in Father *Quesnel's Roman Code*[c]; and *Cresconius* quoteth

[a] Ib. & p. 691. [b] Inn. ep. 3. c. 1. t. 1. p. 755, 756. [c] Cod. Rom. a Ques. cum. Leone edit. c. 29. p. 118.

quoteth no other Decrees of *Syricius* but what are taken from this Letter. It is dated the Third of the Ides of *February*, that is the Eleventh of that Month 385, *Arcadius* and *Bauto* being Conſuls (A).

The Celibacy of the Clergy firſt propoſed in the Council of Elvira.

As Prieſts and Deacons are commanded, by the Seventh Article of this Letter, to abſtain from Marriage, and this is the firſt Opportunity that hath offered of mentioning the Celibacy of the Clergy, a ſhort Digreſſion on ſuch a material Point of Diſcipline in the Church may not, perhaps, be unacceptable to the Reader. The laying of this heavy Burden on the Shoulders of the Clergy, a Burden too heavy for moſt of them to bear, as Experience hath ſhewn, was firſt moved in the Council of *Elvira*, held about the Year 300, according to the moſt probable Opinion; and, being warmly promoted by the celebrated *Oſius* of *Cordoua*, and *Felix* of *Acci*, now *Guadix* in *Andaluſia*, who preſided at that Aſſembly, it paſſed into a Law; and all Biſhops, Preſbyters, Deacons, and Subdeacons, were commanded, on Pain of Depoſition, *to abſtain from Wives, and the begetting*

(A) The Jeſuit *Papebrok* highly extols this Letter (1), but, at the ſame time, doth not think it quite pure and genuine, becauſe the Date, ſaith he, hath been added to it; for the other Letters of *Syricius*, and likewiſe thoſe of his Predeceſſors bear no Date. But can we conclude from thence, that they never had any? Some of the Letters of *Innocent* I. are dated, and ſome without a Date, and he admitteth both. The Tranſcribers contented themſelves, for the moſt part, with copying the Body of the Letter, and neglected the reſt. *Papebrok* adds, that the Date ought to have been expreſſed thus: *Arcadio Aug. et Bautone viro clar. Conſſ.* and not *Arcadio et Bautone viris clariſſimis*, as it is in that Letter. But might not this Miſtake be owing to the Ignorance of the Tranſcribers, who, finding, in the Original, only the Two Letters, *V. C.* which are to be met with in many antient Writeings, ſet down *viris clariſſimis*, inſtead of *viro clariſſimo*? *Papebrok* muſt have obſerved the ſame Miſtake in the Letter, which Pope *Innocent* I. wrote to the Council of *Milevum* (2), and which he alloweth to be altogether genuine. For Slips or Overſights of this Nature, hardly avoidable, no Piece ought to be condemned, or even ſuſpected.

(1) Bolland. prop. p. 58. (2) Concil. t. 2. p. 1289.

begetting of Children. These are the very Words of the 33d Canon of that Council[d]. That, until this time, the Clergy were allowed to marry, even in *Spain*, is manifest from the 65th Canon of the same Council, excluding from the Communion of the Church, even at the Point of Death, such Ecclesiastics, as, knowing their Wives to be guilty of Adultery, should not, upon the first Notice of their Crime, immediately turn them out of Doors[e]. How long the 33d Canon continu'd in Vigour, is uncertain; nay, it may be questioned whether it ever took place: if it ever did, it was out of Date, or at least not generally observed by the *Spanish* Clergy, in the Time of *Syricius*, as evidently appeareth from the Words of his Letter, or Answer to *Himerius* of *Tarragon:* I said, by the *Spanish* Clergy; for no such Injunction had yet been laid on the Ecclesiastics of any other Country or Nation. About Fifteen Years after, was held the Council of *Ancyra*, in which it was decreed, That *if any Deacon did not declare at his Ordination, that he designed to marry, he ought not to be allowed to marry after; but might, if he made such a Declaration, because, in that Case, the Bishop tacitly consented to it.* The Council of *Neocæsarea*, which assembled soon after that of *Ancyra*, and consisted, in great Part, of the same Bishops, commanded *such Presbyters as married after their Ordination to be degraded.* In the Year 325, was held the Council of *Nice*; and, in that great Assembly, it was moved, perhaps by *Osius*, who acted a chief Part there, that Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons and Subdeacons, should be debarred from all Commerce with the Wives they had married before their Ordination. But this Motion was warmly opposed by *Paphnutius*, who had himself ever led a chaste and single Life, and was one of the most eminent and illustrious Prelates, at that time, in the Church. He represented that the Burden they proposed laying on the Clergy was too heavy;

[d] Conc. t. 1. p. 1210. [e] Ib. p. 1329.

heavy; that few had ſufficient Strength to bear it; that the Women, thus abandoned by their Huſbands, would be expoſed to great Dangers; that Marriage was no Pollution, but, according to St. *Paul*, commendable; that thoſe therefore, who were not married, when firſt admitted to the Sacerdotal Functions, ſhould continue in that State; and ſuch as were, ſhould continue to live with their Wives. Thus *Sozomen* [f], *Socrates* [g], and *Suidas* [h] (B).

The Advice of Paphnutius *was applauded by the Aſſembly*, add the above-mentioned Hiſtorians, *and the Point in Diſpute was left undecided.* In the Year 340, it was decreed, in the Council of *Arles*, that *no Man, incumbered with a Wife, ſhould be admitted to Holy Orders, unleſs he promiſed, with his Wife's Approbation and conſent, to abſtain for ever from the conjugal Duty.*

This is all I can find in the antient Records concerning the Continence or Celibacy of the Clergy, before the Time of *Syricius*. And hence it is manifeſt, that both *Clichtoneus*, and *Melanchthon* were greatly miſtaken; the former in affirming, which many have done after him, that Celibacy was firſt impoſed

[f] Soz. l. 1. c. 23. [g] Socr. l. 1. c. 11. [h] Suid. in vit. Paph.

(B) I am not unappriſed, that this Account is rejected by *Baronius* (1), and *Bellarmine* (2), as fabulous; but notwithſtanding the Pains they have both taken to make it appear incredible, F. *Lupus* alloweth it to be true (3), although a no leſs zealous Stickler for the Diſcipline of the Church of *Rome* than either of them. *Ruffinus*, I own, taketh no notice of this Tranſaction, as *Valeſius* well obſerveth. But hath no true Tranſaction been, either wilfully or ignorantly, omitted by that Writer? *Valeſius* well knows, that many have; and had he peruſed that Author with a little more Attention he would not have ſo poſitively affirmed, that no one ever named *Paphnutius* among the Biſhops of *Egypt*, who aſſiſted at the Council of *Nice*, ſince he is named among them by *Ruffinus*, and with great Commendations (4).

(1) Bar ad ann. 58. n. 21. (2) Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 20.
(3) Lup. in can. p. 114. (4) Ruf. l. 1. c. 4.

impoſed upon the Clergy by *Syricius*[i]; and the latter by confidently aſſerting, that Celibacy was not required of the Miniſters of the Goſpel by any Council, but by the Popes, in Oppoſition to all Councils and Synods[k]. It muſt be owned, however, that this Law was not ſo generally obſerved before the Time of *Syricius*, as it was after. For it was not long after his Time, before it became an eſtabliſhed Point of Diſcipline in moſt of the Weſtern Churches, not in virtue of his Letter, or of thoſe which his Succeſſors wrote to the ſame Purpoſe, but becauſe it was injoined by the Synods of each particular Nation. Thus it was eſtabliſhed in *Africa* by the Council of *Carthage* in 390, in *Gaul* by one held at *Orleans*, by Two at *Tours*, and one at *Agde*; in *Spain* by Three held at *Toledo*; in *Germany*, by the Councils of *Aquiſgranum*, or *Aix la Chapelle*, of *Worms*, and of *Mentz*. We know of none in *Britain*: and that it did not even begin to take Place here till the Arrival of *Auſtin*, in the Sixth Century, may be ſufficiently proved from the Letters of that Monk to *Gregory*, and *Gregory*'s Anſwer to him; but of that more hereafter (C).

The preſent Practice of the Church of Rome, *with reſpect to this Point.*

As to the preſent Practice and Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, with reſpect to this, in their Opinion, moſt eſſential Point of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, no Man is allowed, after his Ordination, to marry, or

[i] Chricht. de contin. ſacerd. c. 4. [k] Melanch. in Apol. p. 13.

(C) I cannot forbear taking notice here of an inexcuſable Miſtake in the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of* England, *by* Nicolas Harpſfeld, *Archdeacon of* Canterbury, a Work in great Requeſt abroad. That Writer telleth us, that *Reſtitutus*, Biſhop of *London*, aſſiſted at the Council of *Arles*, and ſigned the above-mentioned Canon, forbidding a Man incumbered with a Wife to be admitted to Orders, unleſs he promiſed, with her Conſent, to refrain from all Commerce with her after his Ordination. He leaveth us to infer from thence, that this Canon was received in *Britain* (1). But ſurely *Harpsfeld* muſt never have ſeen either the Subſcriptions, or the Acts of that Council. Had he ſeen the Subſcriptions, he had hardly

(1) Harpſ. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Anglican. p. 26.

or to cohabit with the Wife he had married before; nay, in order to prevent all poſſible means even of any clandeſtine Commerce between them, the Woman muſt, by a ſolemn Vow of Chaſtity, renounce all Claims on her Huſband, and, retiring into a Monaſtery, bind herſelf by a ſecond Vow to continue there, without ever once going out, on any Pretence whatſoever, ſo long as her Huſband liveth, who cannot be admitted ſo much as to the Rank of a Subdeacon, until ſhe is ſecured by theſe Two Vows. Such is the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome*, although Subdeacons were allowed to marry long after the Time of *Syricius*, who, in his Letter, mentioneth only Deacons and Preſbyters, and doth not even oblige them to part with their Wives, but only excludes them from riſing to a higher Degree in the Church. Pope *Leo the Great*, choſen in 440, was the firſt who extended the Law of Celibacy to the Subdeacons, commanding them, in a Letter, which he wrote about the Year 442, to *Ruſticus* Biſhop of *Narbonne*, to abſtain, as well as the Deacons, Preſbyters, and Biſhops, from all Commerce with their Wives. But this Law was obſerved by very few Churches. In the Time of Pope *Gregory the Great*, that is, in the Latter-end of the Sixth Century, it had not yet taken place, even in *Sicily*, although reckoned among the *Suburbicarian* Provinces: it was firſt

hardly omitted Two *Britiſh* Biſhops out of Three. For, beſides the Names of *Reſtitutus*, I find among the Subſcriptions, the Names of *Adelphus de colonia Londinenſium*, that is, as is commonly believed, of *Colcheſter*, and of *Hibernus* of *Eboracum*, or *York*. Had he ſeen the Acts, he had never been guilty of ſuch a groſs Miſtake as to aſcribe the above-mentioned Canon to the Council of *Arles*, at which *Reſtitutus* aſſiſted; ſince that Council was held againſt the *Donatiſts* of *Africa*, in the Year 314, and not the leaſt Mention was made there of the Celibacy of the Clergy (2) The Second Council of *Arles* was held about Twenty ſix Years after, and of that Council the ſaid Canon is the Second.

(2) Concil. t. 1. p. 1426 — 1429.

first introduced into that Island by him; but he allowed those to cohabit with their Wives, who had been ordained without a previous Promise to live continent, although he would not suffer them to be raised to a higher Degree without such a Promise. *Bellarmine*[h], and the other Divines of the Church of *Rome*, to soften the Odium, which the hard, and commonly impracticable, Command she layeth on her Clergy, must reflect on her, represent Continency as a Virtue to be easily acquired. Their Ascetics seem better acquainted with the Difficulties and Struggles attending the Practice of that Virtue, than their Divines; for they prescribe, as the sole Means of attaining it, constant Prayer, frequent Fasting, macerating the rebelling Flesh with all kinds of Austerities, and principally the avoiding of all Female Company. And, if these be the sole Means of attaining it, I leave the Reader to judge how few of their Clergy do attain it.

In the primitive Church married and unmarried Men raised indiscriminately to Ecclesiastical Dignities.

No one is so little versed in the History of the Church, as not to know, that, in the Three first Centuries of the Christian Religion, married and unmarried Men were indiscriminately raised to the Episcopal, and every other Ecclesiastical Dignity; nay, *Jerom* writes, that in his Time, that is, in the Fourth Century, the former were, for the most part, preferred to the latter, not in regard to their greater Merit, but because, in such Elections, the unmarried Men were out-numbered by the married, who chose to be governed by one in their own Station of Life[i]. It is hence manifest, that Marriage was not thought, in *Jerom*'s Time, inconsistent with, or any Bar to, the Episcopal Dignity. And why should it? since, excepting St. *John*, the Apostles themselves were all married, as we are told, in express Terms, by *Ignatius* the Martyr[k], who was their Cotemporary,

[h] Bell. de cler. l. 1. c. 21. [i] Hier. in Jovin. l. 1. [k] Ign. ep. ad Philadelph.

rary and Diſciple, and whoſe Authority ought, on that Conſideration, to be of greater Weight than that of all the other Fathers together. *But ſuch of the primitive Clergy*, ſaith *Bellarmine*[1]. *as were married before their Ordination, abſtained ever after from the Uſe of Matrimony: let our Adverſaries produce, if they can, but a ſingle Evidence of a Presbyter or Biſhop's having any Commerce with their Wives.* It lyeth upon him to ſhew they had not. We know nothing to the contrary, and therefore may well ſuppoſe, that, purſuant to the Advice given by the Apoſtle to all Huſbands and Wives, they *came together* after Ordination as they did before, *leſt Satan ſhould tempt them for their Incontinency.*

Celibacy recommended by the Fathers.

The Fathers, it is true, out of a miſtaken Notion of an extraordinary Merit attending Celibacy in this Life, and an extraordinary Reward reſerved for it in the other, began very early to recommend it to Perſons of all Ranks and Stations, but more eſpecially to the Clergy, as the principal Excellence and Perfection of a Chriſtian. By their Exhortations, and the Praiſes they were conſtantly beſtowing on Virginity, Celibacy, and Continence, many among the Clergy, and even ſome of the Laity, were wrought up to ſuch a Pitch of Enthuſiaſm, as to mutilate themſelves, thinking they could by no other means be ſufficiently qualified for the unnatural, but meritorious, State of Celibacy. And, what is very ſurprizing, this Practice became ſo common in the End of the Third, and the Beginning of the Fourth Century, that the Fathers of *Nice*, were obliged to reſtrain it by a particular Canon. They enacted one accordingly, excluding for ever from the Prieſthood, ſuch *as ſhould make themſelves Eunuchs, the Preſervation of their Life or Health not requiring ſuch a Mutilation.* By the ſame Canon they depoſed and degraded all, who ſhould thus maim themſelves after their

[1] Bellarm. de cler. l. 1. c. 20.

their Ordination [l]. But although the Fathers warmly recommended Celibacy to the unmarried Clergy, and continence to the married, neither was looked upon as an Obligation, until late in the Fourth Century, and not even then in all Places; for *Epiphanius*, who lived in the Beginning of the Fifth, writes, that although *Men ſtill begetting Children* were excluded by the Eccleſiaſtical Canons from every Dignity and Degree in the Church, yet they were in ſome Places admitted as Subdeacons, Deacons, and Preſbyters, becauſe thoſe Canons were not yet univerſally obſerved [m]; ſo that, according to *Epiphanius*, it was not by the Apoſtles (as the Divines of the Church of *Rome* pretend), but by the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, that this Obligation was laid on the Clergy; and, in his Time, thoſe Canons were not yet univerſally complied with; nor indeed many Ages after: nay, in the *Greek* Church, the Clergy are, to this Day, allowed to cohabit with the Wives they married before their Ordination; and, in this Kingdom, Celibacy was not univerſally eſtabliſhed until after the Conqueſt, as I ſhall have Occaſion to ſhew in the Sequel of the preſent Hiſtory.

never injoined by the Apoſtles;

deemed by the Pagans the higheſt Degree of Sanctity.

The abſtaining from lawful, as well as unlawful, Pleaſures, was deemed, by the antient Pagans, eſpecially in the Eaſt, the higheſt Degree of Sanctity and Perfection. Hence ſome of their Prieſts, in Compliance with this Notion, and to recommend themſelves to the Eſteem of the People, did not only profeſs, promiſe, and vow an eternal Abſtinence from all Pleaſures of that Nature, as thoſe of the Church of *Rome* do, but put it out of their Power ever to enjoy them. Thus the Prieſts of *Cybele*, *by becoming Prieſts, ceaſed to be Men*, to borrow the Expreſſion of *Jerom*; and the *Hierophantes*, who were the firſt Miniſters of Religion among the *Athenians*, ren-

[l] Theod. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. l. 2. p. 28, 29. Ambr. ep. 25.
[m] Epiph. hæreſ. 59.

rendered themſelves equally incapable of transgreſſing the Vows they had made, by conſtantly drinking the cold Juice of Hemlock [n]. A Stoic, called *Cheremon*, introduced by *Jerom* to deſcribe the Lives of the *Egyptian* Prieſts, telleth us, among other things, that, from the Time they addicted themſelves to the Service of the Gods, they renounced all Intercourſe and Commerce with Women; and, the better to conquer their natural Inclinations, abſtained altogether from Meat and Wine. Several other Inſtances might be alleged to ſhew, that Celibacy was embraced and practiſed by the Pagan Prieſts, long before the Birth of the Chriſtian Religion; and, conſequently, that it was not Religion, but Superſtition, that firſt laid the Prieſthood under ſuch an Obligation. The Church of *Rome* hath borrowed, as is notorious, ſeveral Ceremonies, Cuſtoms, and Practices of the Pagans, and perhaps the Celibacy of the Prieſthood among the reſt: I ſay, *perhaps*, becauſe it might have been ſuggeſted to her by the ſame Spirit of Superſtition, that ſuggeſted it to them: for where-ever the ſame Spirit prevaileth, it will ever operate in the ſame manner, and be attended with the ſame, or the like Effects. Thus we find the ſame Auſterities practiſed by the Pagans in the *Eaſt-Indies*, and other idolatrous Nations, that are practiſed and recommended by the Church of *Rome*; and yet no Man can imagine thoſe Auſterities to have been by either borrowed of the other. There is almoſt an intire Conformity between the Laws, Diſcipline, and Hierarchy of the antient *Druids*, and the preſent *Roman-Catholic* Clergy; nay, the latter claim the very ſame Privileges, Prerogatives, and Exemptions, as were claimed and enjoyed by the former [o]: and yet we cannot well ſuppoſe them to have been guided therein by their Example. Celibacy

[n] Hier. l. 2. in Jov. [o] Vide Cæſ. comm. de bell. Gall. l. 6. Cic. div. l. 1.

bacy was discountenanced by the *Romans*, who nevertheless had their *Vestals*, instituted by their second King at a Time when, the new City being yet thinly inhabited, Marriage ought in both Sexes to have been most encouraged: and the same Spirit, which suggested to that superstitious Prince the Institution of the Vestals, suggested the like Institutions to other Pagan Nations, and to the Church of *Rome* that of so many different Orders of Nuns.

How much better had the Church of *Rome* consulted her own Reputation, had she either, in Opposition to the Pagan Priesthood, allowed her Clergy the Use of Matrimony, or, by a more perfect Imitation of their Discipline, with the Law of Celibacy, prescribed the like Methods of preserving it! How many Enormities had been prevented by either of these Means, the World knoweth. But none of her Clergy have the Observance of their Vows so much at Heart, as to imitate either the *Athenian* or the *Egyptian* Priests: and as for those of *Cybele*, they are so far from conforming to their Practice, that a Law subjecting them to it hath kept them out of Protestant Kingdoms, when the Fear of Death could not.

The Celibacy of the Clergy a bad Institution.

If every Law or Institution is to be judged good or evil according to the Good and Evil attending them, it is by daily Experience but too manifest, that the forced Celibacy of the Clergy ought to be deemed of all Institutions the very worst. Indeed all sensible Men of that Church know and lament the innumerable Evils which the Celibacy of her Clergy occasioneth, and must always occasion, in spite of all Remedies that can be applied to it. But she findeth one Advantage in it, which, in her Eyes, maketh more than sufficient Amends for all those Evils, *viz.* her ingrossing by that means to herself all the Thoughts and Attention of her Clergy, which were they allowed to marry, would be divided between her and their Families, and each of them would

would have a ſeparate Intereſt from that of the Church. Several Cuſtoms and Practices, once warmly eſpouſed by that Church, have, in Proceſs of Time, been abrogated and quite laid aſide, on Account of the Inconveniences attending them; and this, which long Experience hath ſhewn to be attended with more pernicious Conſequences than any other, had, but for that political View, been likewiſe aboliſhed.

Another Letter, univerſally aſcribed to *Syricius*, hath reached our Times. It is written in a very perplexed and obſcure Style; beareth no Date; is not to be found either in *Dionyſius Exiguus*, or any antient Code; and is addreſſed to *all the Orthodox dwelling in different Provinces*[p]: Which is manifeſtly a Miſtake, ſince *Syricius* deſires thoſe, to whom it is addreſſed, to confirm it with their Subſcriptions, which cannot be underſtood but of Biſhops. However, as it is received by all as genuine, I ſhall not take upon me to reject it as ſpurious. The Subject of this Letter is the Ordination of the Miniſters of the Church; and the Firſt Article is againſt thoſe who pretend to paſs from the Vanities of the World to the Epiſcopal Dignity. *Syricius* writes, that they came often to him, attended with numerous Retinues, begging him to ordain them; but that they had never been able to prevail upon him to grant them their Requeſt. In the Second Article he complaineth of the Monks, who were conſtantly wandering about the Country, and on whom the Biſhops choſe rather to confer holy Orders, and the Epiſcopal Dignity itſelf, than to relieve them with Alms. The Third and laſt Article forbiddeth a Layman or Neophyte to be ordained either Deacon or Preſbyter. If this Letter be genuine, *Syricius* was the firſt Biſhop of *Rome* who ſtyled himſelf *Pope*, as *Papebrok* well obſerveth[q]; for the Title of his Letter, as tranſ-

Another Letter of Syricius.

[p] Conc. t. 2. p. 1028. [q] Bolland. prop. p. 213.

transmitted to us, runs thus; *Pope Syricius* to *the Orthodox*, &c. The Word importeth no more than Father, and it was antiently given, out of Respect, to all Bishops, as I have observed elsewhere; but I have found none before *Syricius* who distinguished themselves with that Title.

Jerom *retires from* Rome.

Jerom continued at *Rome* some Months after the Death of his great Patron *Damasus*. But finding himself obnoxious to the *Roman* Clergy, for the Liberty he had taken in some of his Writings to censure their effeminate and licentious Lives, and, on the other hand, not being countenanced and supported by *Syricius*, as he had been by his Predecessor, he thought it advisеable to abandon that City, and return to *Palæstine*. Some pretend, but without sufficient Authority, that *Syricius* joined the rest in reviling and persecuting him.

The Usurper Maximus *writeth to* Syricius.

Baronius hath inserted, in his Annals[r], a Letter from the Usurper *Maximus*, who reigned in *Gaul*; from which we learn, that *Syricius* had wrote first to him, exhorting him to continue steady in the Catholic Faith; being, perhaps, apprehensive lest he should suffer himself to be imposed upon by the *Priscillianists*, who were very numerous in *Gaul*, and complaining to him of the undue Ordination of a Presbyter named *Agricius*. *Maximus*, in his Answer, pretendeth great Zeal for the true Faith, and promiseth to assemble the Bishops of *Gaul*, and of the Five Provinces, meaning *Gallia Narbonensis*, to examine the Affair of *Agricius*. He assureth *Syricius*, that he hath nothing so much at Heart as to maintain the Catholic Faith pure and uncorrupted, to see a perfect Harmony established among the Prelates of the Church, and to suppress the many Disorders which had prevailed at the Time of his Accession to the Empire, and would have soon proved incurable, had they been neglected. He adds, that many shocking Abominations of the *Manichees*, meaning no doubt

[r] Bar. ad ann. 387. n. 65, 66. ex t. 1. ep. Rom. Pont. p. 48.

doubt the *Priſcillianiſts*, had been diſcovered, not by groundleſs Conjectures and Surmiſes, but by their own Confeſſion before the Magiſtrates, as *Syricius* might learn from the Acts. For *Maximus* cauſed the Ringleaders of that Sect to be put to Death this very Year, convicted before the Magiſtrates of the groſſeſt Immoralities (A). Theſe were *Priſcillian* himſelf, *Felicisſimus*, and *Armenus*, Two Eccleſiaſtics, who had but very lately embraced his Doctrine; *Aſarinus* and *Aurelius*, Two Deacons; *Latronianus*, or, as *Jerom* calleth him, *Matronianus*, a Layman, and *Euchrocia*, the Widow of the Orator *Delphidius*, who had profeſſed Eloquence in the City of *Bourdeaux* a few Years before. Theſe were, by

(A) The firſt Author of this Sect was one *Mark*, a Native of *Memphis* in *Egypt*, a famous Magician, and once a Follower of the Doctrine of the *Manichees* (1). From *Egypt* he travelled into Spain, where he had for his Diſciples a Woman of Quality named *Agapa*, *Elpidius* the Rhetorician, and *Agagius* (2). *Priſcillian*, of whom I ſhall ſpeak hereafter, was the Diſciple and Succeſſor of the two latter. *Jerom* telleth us, upon the Authority of *Irenæus*, whom he quotes, that *Mark* paſſed from the Banks of the *Rhone* into *Aquitaine*, and from thence into *Spain* (3); which made *Baronius* write, that he firſt infected *Gaul* (4). But no ſuch thing was ever affirmed by *Irenæus*; and beſides, *Jerom* confounds the Sect of the *Marcoſians* with that of the *Priſcillianiſts*, and the Author of the former, who was contemporary with *Irenæus*, with the Author of the latter, who lived in the Fourth Century.

The *Priſcillianiſts* broached no new Doctrine, but formed a new Sect, by adopting every impious Opinion that had been broached by others; whence their Sect is ſtyled by *Auſtin*, the common Sink of all other Hereſies (5). By their external Behaviour, which was extremely modeſt and compoſed, they gained many Followers, whom, by degrees, they let into the Abominations of their Sect; for there was no Lewdneſs which they did not encourage and Practice, rejecting Matrimony for no other Reaſon, but becauſe it confined a Man to one Woman, and a Woman to one Man (6). They held it no Crime to ſpeak contrary

(1) Sulp. l. 2. p. 170. Iſid. Hiſp. de Script. Eccleſ. c. 2. (2) Id. ib. (3) Hier. ep. 29. (4) Bar. ad ann. 381. n. 113, 114. (5) Aug. hær. 70. p. 13. (6) Id. ib. & Leo. ep. 93.

by the Order of *Maximus*, all beheaded this Year at *Treves*. The reſt of *Priſcillian*'s Followers, whom they could diſcover and apprehend, were either baniſhed or confined.

They are honoured by their Followers as Saints and Martyrs.

But theſe Severities ſerved only to encreaſe the Evil which they were employed to cure. The Bodies of *Priſcillian*, and of thoſe who had ſuffered with him, were conveyed by their Friends and Adherents into *Spain*, and there interred with great Pomp and Solemnity; their Names were added to thoſe of other Saints and Martyrs, their Firmneſs and Conſtancy extolled, and their Doctrine embraced by ſuch Numbers of Proſelytes, that it ſpread in a ſhort Time over

trary to what they thought and believed, and to confirm with an Oath what they ſaid when they were talking to People of a different Perſuaſion. This was one of their favourite Maxims, which, above all others, they took care to inculcate to their Proſelytes, often repeating to them, and among themſelves, the famous Verſe;

Jura, perjura, ſecretum prodere noli.

Swear, forſwear, but never betray a Secret (7).

Hence it was no eaſy Matter to diſcover them, for they mixed with the Orthodox at Divine Service, received the Sacraments of the Church, and diſowned, with the moſt ſolemn Oaths, the Doctrine which they had been heard by many to utter and teach (8). To this Sect *Priſcillian*, who gave Name to it, was gained by the above mentioned *Elpidius* and *Agagius*. He was a Man of Birth and Fortune, being deſcended of an antient and illuſtrious Family in *Spain*, and is ſaid to have been endowed with extraordinary Parts, and well verſed in every Branch of Learning; ſo that many were induced by his Example to embrace the new Sect, and more by his Eloquence; for he had a particular Gift of ſpeaking well, and gaining the Affections of all who heard him (9). Among his Followers were ſeveral Perſons of the firſt Rank, both Men and Women, and even ſome Biſhops, namely, *Vegetinus*, *Symphoſius*, *Inſtantius*, and *Salvianus*, of whom the two latter entered into an indiſſoluble League and Alliance with him (1).

(7) Aug. ib. ep. 253. & ad Conc. c. 2. (8) Id. ib. (9) Sulp. l 2. p. 170. Hier. in Iſai. 64. p. 240. (1) Sulp. ib. p. 171. Concil. t. 1. p. 741.

over all the Provinces between the *Pirenees* and the Ocean [d]. *Symphoſius*, Metropolitan of *Galicia*, whom, after the Death of *Priſcillian*, they looked upon as the chief Man and Head of their Sect, took care to fill all the vacant Sees in that Province with Biſhops of his own Communion. *Dictinius*, whom he raiſed among the reſt to that Dignity, is ſuppoſed by St. *Auſtin* [e] to have been the Author of a Book, famous in thoſe Times, ſtyled *Libra*, or the *Pound* (A). However, both he and *Symphoſius* were afterwards convinced of their Errors; and, deſiring thereupon to be reconciled with the Church, they undertook a Journey to *Milan*, in order to engage St. *Ambroſe*, Biſhop of that City, in their favours. He received them with the greateſt Marks of Kindneſs and Affection; and being ſatisfied with the Terms of Reconciliation, which they themſelves propoſed, and promiſed to obſerve, he wrote in their Behalf to the Biſhops of *Spain*, who, at his Requeſt, admitted them to their Communion [f] (B).

Many embrace their Doctrine.

Two of their leading Men renounce their Errors;

In the Year 438 of the *Spaniſh* and 400 of the common Æra, a Council was held at *Toledo*; and, in

and are admitted to the Communion of the Church by the Council of Toledo.

[d] Hier. ep. 29. p. 742. ed. Binian. [e] Auguſt. ad Con. c. 3. [f] Concil. t. 1.

(A) It was ſo called becauſe it contained Twelve Queſtions, as the *Roman* Pound did Twelve Ounces. In that Piece the Author endeavoured to prove, from the Practice of the Patriarchs, of the Prophets, Apoſtles, Angels, and of *Chriſt* himſelf, that a Lye could be no Crime, when uttered to conceal our Religion (2).

(B). That theſe two Biſhops ſhould have applied to St. *Ambroſe*, and not to *Siricius*, is what *Baronius* cannot Brook; and therefore to bring in, right or wrong, the Biſhop of *Rome*, he quoteth a Paſſage of the Council of *Toledo*, where the Fathers of that Aſſembly, ſpeaking of the Letter which St. *Ambroſe* had wrote in favour of *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*, adds the following Words in a Parentheſis; *Which things were likewiſe ſuggeſted by Pope* Syricius, *of holy Memory* (3). But as theſe Words have no manner

(2) Id. ib. c. 2, & 18. (3) Concil. t. 2. p. 1230.

in the Presence of that Assembly, *Symphocius*, *Dictinius*, and *Comasus*, one of *Symphosius*'s Presbyters, solemnly abjured the Errors of *Priscillian*, anathematized the Doctrine, Sect, and Books of that Heretic, and readily signed the Confession of Faith which the Council had drawn up. Their Example was followed by Three other Bishops, *viz. Paternus*, *Isonius*, and *Vegetinus*, who were all admitted to the Communion of the Church, and even allowed to keep their Sees, although unduly preferred, *on Condition the Bishops of* Rome *and* Milan *should consent thereto, and restore them to the Peace of the Church* g. From these Words, which are the very Words of the Council, it is manifest, first, that the Fathers, who composed that Assembly, were Strangers to the Bishop of *Rome*'s universal Jurisdiction; and, secondly, that the Bishop of *Milan* did not act, as *Baronius* pretendeth, on that Occasion, as the Pope's Legate. Their requiring the Approbation of the Bishop of *Milan*, besides that of the Bishop of *Rome*, sufficiently proves the one; and their requiring the Approbation of the Bishop of *Rome*, besides that of *Milan*, the other.

Four other Bishops, *viz. Herenius*, *Donatus*, *Acurius*, and *Æmilius*, could by no means be induced to follow the Example of *Symphosius* and *Dictinius*; and were

g Concil. t. 1. p. 742.

manner of Connection with the rest, it is manifest they have been foisted in on purpose to bring *Syricius* upon the Stage; and were we to admit them as genuine, we could only conclude from thence, that *Syricius* too had wrote to the Bishops of *Spain* in Behalf of *Symphocius* and *Dictinius*. *Baronius* indeed goeth a great way farther; for he inferreth from the above-mentioned Words, that St. *Ambrose* acted by the Advice and Direction of *Syricius*; and from thence by a second Inference, which could occur to none but himself, that both *Ambrose*, and *Simplicius*, who succeeded him in the See of *Milan*, were the Pope's Legates (4). It is by such far-fetched Inferences and Deductions that he endeavours, throughout his voluminous Performance, to mislead his unwary Readers into a Belief of the Pope's Supremacy.

(4) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 54.

were thereupon depoſed by the Council, and cut off from the Communion of the Catholic Church. The Biſhops of *Rome* and *Milan* not only confirmed the Acts of the Council with reſpect to *Symphoſius* and *Dictinius*, but ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of the Biſhops of *Bætica* and the *Carthageneſe*, who, thinking the Council had dealt too favourably with them, refuſed to admit them to their Communion [h]. *Dictinius* died in 420, and is now honoured in *Spain* as a Saint, although it may be juſtly queſtioned whether he deſerves that Honour. *Idatius* the Chronologiſt, who was a Native of *Spain*, and raiſed there to the Epiſcopal Dignity about the Year 428, mentioneth him without ſaying any thing in his Praiſe, or taking the leaſt notice of his being honoured then as a Saint. St. *Auſtin* ſpeaketh doubtfully even of his Converſion [i], and at the ſame time telleth us, that his Book was highly eſteemed by the *Priſcillianiſts*, and his Memory no leſs revered; which, notwithſtanding the eminent Sanctity aſcribed to him by *Baronius* [k], giveth us room to ſuſpect, that the Honour now paid him is owing to a Tradition handed down by the *Priſcillianiſts*. For thus was *Priſcillian* himſelf once revered both as a Saint and a Martyr. Nay, the Author of the Notes on *Sulpitius Severus* aſſureth us, that he hath ſeen his Name in ſome not very antient Martyrologies; and *Petrus de Natalibus* hath allowed, both to him, and to *Latronianus*, who ſuffered with him, a Place among the Martyrs of the Church, pretending to be countenanced therein by the Authority of *Jerom* [l]. And truly it muſt be owned, that *Jerom*, in the Year 392, wrote very favourably of *Priſcillian*. *He was executed*, ſaith he, *by the Faction of* Ithacius, *being accuſed by ſome as if he had embraced the Hereſy of the* Gnoſtics; *but others maintained, that he held not the Doctrine*

The Acts of that Council confirmed by St. Ambroſe *and* Syricius.

Dictinius honoured as a Saint.

Priſcillian honoured as a Saint and a Martyr.

[h] Concil. t. 2. p. 1279. [i] Aug. ad Conc. c. 3. [k] Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 56. [l] Pet. de Natal. l. 11. c. 89.

Doctrine and Tenets with which he was charged [m]. But being afterwards better informed, he styleth him *an execrable Man* [n], and condemneth his Doctrine as an *infamous Heresy*, as a *Plague* and *Contagion*, that cruelly ravaged most of the *Spanish* Provinces [o]. It is not therefore without Reason that the Church of *Rome* now anathematizeth, as an Heretic, the Man she once revered as a Saint. Such hath been the Fate of many others, judged by *Baronius* himself unworthy of the Worship that was paid them, and therefore set aside, when, by the Command of *Gregory* XIII. he revised and corrected the *Roman Martyrology*. As for *Dictinius*, he hath not yet been driven out of Heaven, although nobody can well tell how he came in. It is true, both he and *Symphosius* are styled *Bishops of holy Memory*, in the Abstract of the Council of *Toledo*, which is supposed to have been done about the Year 447. This is all *Baronius* can plead in favour of his *eminent Sanctity*. A poor Charter indeed to hold a Place in Heaven by, and claim the Worship and Honours attending it! For the Author of that Abstract is utterly unknown; and, besides, he canonizeth alike *Symphosius* and *Dictinius*, styling them both Bishops of holy Memory. Why then should his Authority have so much Weight with respect to the one, and none at all in regard to the other? If we bar Prescription, which surely can have no room here, *Dictinius* can have no more Right to keep the Place he hath, than *Symphosius* to claim the Place he hath not. Nay, the latter would have a far better Right, were it true, that *Dictinius* relapsed into the Errors he had abjured, and was on that Account deposed with several other Bishops of his Sect. This I read in an Author of great Note [p]; but as he advanceth it upon the Authority of another, *viz.* of *Idiatius* the Chrono-

[m] Hier. vir. ill. c. 121. [n] Ad Cte. t. 2. p. 152. [o] Id. ep. 82, 29. in Isai. c. 60. [p] Leo, t. 2. p. 831.

Chronologiſt, and the Paſſage he quoteth is not to be found in that Writer, at leaſt in the Editions I have peruſed, it would be both unjuſt and ungenerous to deprive *Dictinius* of, or diſturb him in, the Poſſeſſion of his Saintſhip upon ſuch an Evidence.

Syricius and *Ambroſe*, in Conjunction with the Catholic Biſhops of *Spain*, alarmed at the wonderful Progreſs the Doctrine of *Priſcillian* had made in ſo ſhort a Time, left nothing unattempted they could think of to put a Stop to the growing Evil. But all to no Purpoſe; in ſpite of their utmoſt Efforts, in defiance of the moſt ſevere Laws, that were enacted againſt them, eſpecially by the Emperors *Honorius* and *Theodoſius* the younger, their Numbers increaſed daily, and their Doctrine grew daily more popular; the Severities that were practiſed againſt them, ſerving only to recommend thoſe to the eſteem and Veneration of the Multitude, who ſuffered them, as many did, with Patience and Conſtancy. As they held it lawful to conceal their real Sentiments from the Catholics, by diſowning them with the moſt ſolemn Oaths; the Catholics ſuffered themſelves to be led by a miſtaken Zeal into the ſame Error, diſowning, in like manner, their Sentiments, the better to diſcover thoſe of their Adverſaries. But this pernicious Practice of *defending Truth by deſtroying it, and oppoſing Lyes by Lying*, was fully and unanſwerably confuted by *Auſtin*, in his Anſwer to *Conſentius*, who had wrote to him at Length upon that Subject [a] (A).

The Doctrine of the Priſcillianiſts *taketh deep Root in* Spain.

The

[a] Aug. ad Con. contra mendac. per totum.

(A) The Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, concerning Equivocations, mental Reſervations, and the Lawfulneſs, or rather Obligation, of concealing, with the moſt ſolemn Oaths, what hath been revealed under the Seal of Confeſſion, hath perhaps ſome Affinity with the Doctrine of the *Priſcillianiſts*. What is only known under the Seal of Confeſſion, ſay their Divines, is not known to Man, but to God alone, ſince it was not diſcovered

The indefatigable Pains *Syricius* took, together with the other Catholic Bishops, in suppressing the Heresy of the *Priscillianists*, proved quite unsuccessful, although seconded by the Secular Power, and the severest Laws that had yet been enacted against Heretics. Their Doctrine rather gained, than lost, Ground; and we shall find them in the Sixth Century, that is, Two hundred Years hence, still a numerous Sect, and Councils assembling, to very little Purpose, against them. *Syricius* was not so intent, as we are told, upon maintaining the Doctrine of the Church, as to neglect the Discipline. In order to correct several Abuses, that had begun to prevail, and revive some antient Constitutions, that were grown out of Use, he convened a Council at *Rome*, which is said to have consisted of Eighty Bishops; and, with their Consent and Approbation, established the following Canons: 1. That no one should presume to ordain a Bishop, without the Knowlege of the *Apostolic See*, 2. That no Man should be admitted to the Ecclesiastical Order, who, after the Remission of his Sins, that is, perhaps, after his Baptism, had worn the Sword of worldly Warfare. 3. That no Clerk should marry a Widow. 4. That the *Novatians* and *Montanists*, that is, *Donatists*, should

Council assembled by Syricius at Rome.

vered to a Man, but to God represented by a Man, that is, to the Priest or Confessor; and therefore the Priest may, with a safe Conscience, affirm, even upon Oath, that he knoweth not what he thus knew. It is by recurring to this Doctrine, that F. *Daniel Bartoli*, in his *History of* England, or rather of the *Jesuits* in *England*, endeavoureth to justify the Conduct of the *Jesuit Garnet*, in not discovering the *Gun-powder Plot*, to which he supposeth him to have been privy: But as it was disclosed to him in Confession, or at least under the Seal of Confession, he had sinned grievously by discovering it, although by such a Discovery he might have saved a whole Nation from Destruction (1). So that the violating such a Seal is a far greater Evil than the Loss of so many Lives, than the utter ruin of an intire Nation. A Doctrine evidently repugnant to the Dictates both of Reason and Humanity.

(1) Bar. Istor. d'Inghilterra.

ſhould be received into the Church by the Impoſition of Hands; but that ſuch as, abandoning the Catholic Faith, had been rebaptized by them, ſhould not be re-admitted without performing a long Penance, 5. That the Prieſts and Deacons ſhould live continent, being, by their Office, daily employed in the Divine Miniſtry [b]. Theſe Canons or Decrees, ſay the Roman Catholic Divines, are contained in a Letter, which *Syricius* wrote to the Biſhops of *Africa*, and which was read, and received as a Law, by a Council held ſome Years after at *Tela*, in the Province of *Byzacene*, as appeareth from the Acts of that Council [c]. *Ferrandus*, Deacon of *Carthage*, in his Abridgment of the Canons, done in the Sixth Century, often quotes the Letter of *Syricius*, and taketh particular Notice of the Canons that were copied from it by the Council of *Tela*. The ſame Letter, together with the Acts of that Council, are to be found, Word for Word, in the antient Code of the Church of *Rome*. So that, upon the Whole, we cannot queſtion, ſaith *Baronius*, the Authenticity of that Piece, without rendering the Authority of every other Monument of Antiquity quite precarious, and leaving Men to their own wild and groundleſs Conjectures. But Men of Learning have, of late Years, been too much upon their Guard to admit, without the ſtricteſt Examination, any Piece, however authentic in Appearance, that ſeemed to countenance the extraordinary Power and Authority claimed by the Biſhop of *Rome*. And not without Reaſon, ſince they well knew what Pains had been taken to baniſh Truth, by ſuppreſſing or adulterating the moſt authentic Records, and to eſtabliſh Falſhood, by ſubſtituting in their room fabulous Legends, ſpurious Letters, and Acts of Councils that never were held. As for the Letter aſcribed to *Syricius*, it hath been ſuſpected ever ſince Criticiſm

[b] Concil, t. 2. p. 1028--1030. [c] Concil. 2. t. p. 1578.

ciſm took place [d], and lately rejected, as unqueſtionably ſuppoſititious, by F. *Queſnel*, who, in a learned Diſſertation on that Subject, proveth, in my Opinion, unanſwerably, not only the Letter, but the Acts of the pretended Council of *Tela*, to have been forged, and inſerted, in latter Times, into the Collection of *Ferrandus*, and the *Roman* Code [e] (A).

I find

[d] Vide Blond. cenſur. in decretal. epiſt. p. 550. [e] Queſn. diſſert. 5. ſur S. Leon.

(A) To convince the Reader of this double Forgery, I need not refer him to that judicious Writer. The many groundleſs, perplexed, and contradictory Arguments, or rather Conjectures, alleged by thoſe who have taken moſt pains to prove both the above-mentioned Pieces genuine, *viz.* by *Chifflerus*, *Papebrok*, and Cardinal *Noris*, are, perhaps, a more convincing Proof of their being forged, than any that can be alleged againſt them. There is ſo palpable a Difference, in Point of Style, between this Letter, and that which *Syricius* wrote to *Himerius*, and which is on all Hands allowed to be genuine, that no one can poſſibly ſuppoſe both to have been penned by one and the ſame Perſon. Beſides, in the former Letter *Syricius* abſolutely commandeth, and in this only adviſeth, exhorteth, and intreats the Prieſts and Deacons to live continent. Of theſe two Difficulties none of the Writers I have juſt quoted have thought fit to take the leaſt Notice although they could hardly eſcape their Obſervation. The very firſt Canon or Article of this Letter, for the ſake of which both the Letter itſelf ahd the Acts of the Council, were moſt probably forged, ſufficiently betrays the Forgery. For it is abſolutely unintelligible, and therefore pointed, conſtrued, altered, *&c.* in Twenty different Manners, by thoſe who maintain it to be genuine. Some read it thus; *Ut ſine conſcientia ſedis Apoſtolicæ Primatis nemo audeat ordinare*; *That no one ſhould preſume to ordain without the Knowlege of the Primate of the Apoſtolic See.* I do not find the Biſhops of *Rome* to have ever ſtyled themſelves, in their Letters, *Primates of the Apoſtolic See*; nay, the humble Title of *Primate of the Apoſtolic See* (humble with reſpect to the Biſhop of *Rome*, Primate, Prince, and Monarch of the whole Church), ſo ſoured *Labbeé*, that he fairly owned the Truth, chuſing rather to give up the Letter, than to admit a Title that ſeemed to detract from the *Supremacy*. Beſides, it is very certain, that, in the Time of *Syricius*, the Biſhops of *Rome* were not yet ſo loſt to all Modeſty as to pretend, in open Defiance of the Canons, that no Biſhop ſhould be ordained without their Knowlege. Others read that Article thus: *Ut extra conſcientiam ſedis Apoſto-*

I find no farther Mention made of *Syricius*, in the antient Writers, until the Year 390, when he condemned the Doctrine of *Jovinian*, and caſt him and his Followers out of the Church. *Jovinian* was by Profeſſion a Monk, by Birth a *Latin*, as *Jerom* obſerveth, and the firſt who infected that Language with Hereſy; all, or rather almoſt all, the Hereſies that,

Apoſtolicæ, hoc eſt, Primatis, &c. *That none ſhould preſume to ordain without the Knowledge of the Apoſtolic See, that is, of their Primate.* Now, is it probable, that the Biſhop of *Rome* would have given the Title of *Apoſtolic See* to all the Metropolitan Churches; a Title which Pope *Leo the Great* would not allow even to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* (1)? I might add, that the Author of this Letter writeth, and I think very ridiculouſly, that the *African* Biſhops would have come to *Rome* to aſſiſt at the Council, had they not been prevented by their Infirmities, or old Age; which is ſuppoſing them all to have been old or infirm; that the Subſcription of this Letter is very ſingular, *Data Romæ in Concilio Epiſcoporum octoginta*, which in all other Synodal Letters is placed at the Beginning; that neither this Letter nor the Council of *Tela*, by which it is ſuppoſed to have been quoted, are ever mentioned or taken notice of by any of the Councils, that were afterwards held in *Africa*, to eſtabliſh the Celibacy of the Clergy. Some will have this Letter to have been written only for the Biſhops of the Vicariate of *Rome*, of which *Syricius* was Primate, and to have been ſent by him to the Biſhops of *Africa*, and perhaps to thoſe of the other Provinces, with a Deſign to try whether they might not be prompted to receive the Canons it contained, as general Rules, though made for the Vicariate only. This had been attempting to eſtabliſh at once and in a manner of Surprize, an univerſal Juriſdiction. But I can hardly believe, that, in the Days of *Syricius*, when the Ambition of the Biſhops of *Rome* was yet in its Infancy, they ſhould have aſpired to, or entertained any Notion of, ſuch a Juriſdiction. As to the Council, I ſhall only obſerve here, that it is ſaid in all the printed Copies of the Councils, all the antient Manuſcripts, but one, to have been held at *Tela*, in the Province of *Byzacene*, whereas *Tela* is allowed, even by thoſe who defend this Council as genuine, to have belonged to the *Proconſularis*. They have therefore nothing elſe to recur to but the Ignorance of the Tranſcribers, the uſual Refuge in ſuch Caſes, whom they all agree to have been miſtaken, although all equally at a Loſs, and at Variance among themſelves, how to correct the ſuppoſed Miſtake. For, inſtead of *Tela*, ſome read *Zela* or *Zella*, others *Tena*, *Teneptis*,

(1) Leo, ep. 178.

that, for the first Four hundred Years, had disturbed the Peace of the Church, having been broached by *Greeks*, *Chaldæans*, or *Syrians* [f]. He had formerly practised great Austerities, going bare-footed, living upon Bread and Water, covered with a tattered black Garment, and earning his Livelihood with the Sweat of his Brows, his Hands being callous with long and hard Labour [g]. The Doctrine he taught is, by *Jerom*, reduced to the Four following Heads. 1. That those who, with a lively Faith, have been regenerated by Baptism, cannot afterwards be overcome by the Devil. 2. That for all those, who shall preserve their Baptism, an equal Reward is reserved in Heaven. 3. That there is no Difference of Merit between abstaining from some Meats, and using them with

[f] Hier in Jovin. l. 2. t. 2. p. 94. Aug. hæres. 82. Amb. ep. 7.

[g] Idem ibid. l. 1. c. 25.

neptis, *Teleptus*, &c. In short, there is not a single Town in the whole Province of *Byzacene*, bearing the least Resemblance in Name with *Tela*, that hath not been substituted in its room; nay, some have bestowed that Honour on the smallest Villages, as if it were probable, that, in a Province, filled, as *Byzacene* was, with considerable Cities, and Episcopal Sees, Bishops should chuse to assemble in a Village. To read *Proconsularis* instead of *Byzacene*, as some have done, is contradicting, and consequently giving up, the Acts of that Council; for the Thirty-three Bishops named there, as composing it, were all of the latter Province, and *Vincentius* and *Fortunatianus*, are said to have assisted as Deputies from the former (2). It would be needless to dwell any longer on this Subject, and point out the many Absurdities and Contradictions that occur in the supposed Acts of that Council, since the very Title must convince the impartial Reader, that no such Council was ever held. I cannot, however, help taking Notice of a very extraordinary Canon, quoted by *Ferrandus*, from the Letter of *Syricius*, and approved, as is said there, by the Council of *Tela*; *viz.* That *no Bishop should be ordained by a single Bishop, the Church of* Rome *excepted*. This Exception is not to be found in the Letter ascribed to *Syricius*, from which they make *Ferrandus* quote it; and, besides, the Bishops of *Rome* were never ordained by a single Bishop, nor did they ever take upon them to ordain Bishops alone.

(2) Concil. t. 1. p. 1577.

with Thankſgiving. 4. and laſtly, That Virgins, Widows, and married Women, are in a State of equal Merit; and, conſequently, that all Difference in Merit can only ariſe from their different Actions. That the Two laſt were then counted Hereſies, ſhews that the Church began, in this Century, to be tainted with Doctrines that bordered on Popery, and no-ways conſiſted with the Liberty of the Goſpel[h]. Beſides theſe Tenets, that *Jovinian* taught, as *Ambroſe* and *Auſtin* inform us, that the Virgin *Mary* preſerved her Virginity in conceiving our *Saviour*, but loſt it in bringing him forth, pretending to prove by Arguments, *falſe, but ingenious enough*, ſay they, that we ſhould otherwiſe be obliged to own, with the *Manichees*, the Body of *Chriſt* not to have been real, but aerial[i]. He, beſides, charged the Catholics with *Manicheiſm*, on account of preferring the State of Virginity to that of Matrimony[k]. Both *Jerom* and *Ambroſe* tell us, that, together with his Doctrine, he changed his Manners, renouncing his former Auſterities, and giving himſelf up to all manner of Debauchery, to redeem, as it were, the Time he had loſt[l]. But perhaps this Charge was not well founded, but rather ſuppoſed as a Conſequence of his undervaluing Celibacy, and the Merit aſcribed to it, there being too many Inſtances in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of ſuch Inferences, drawn from Opinions, which were not approved by the Fathers of the Church, as could no-way be juſtified. They often painted thoſe, whom they ſtyled Heretics, in the blackeſt Colours, to prejudice the People more effectually againſt their Doctrine. In this Art *Jerom* excelled all the reſt, and none ever diſagreed with him, who did not at once forfeit thoſe very Virtues, which he himſelf had admired and extolled in them before.

[h] Hier. ib. c. 1. [i] Aug op. imp. l. 4. c. 121. & hær. 82. Amb. ep. 7. [k] Auguſt. in Jul. l. 2. c. 2. & ad Bon. l. 2. c. 2. [l] Hier. ib. c. 25. Amb. ep. 7.

before. He abstained, however, from Matrimony; but merely, say *Austin* and *Jerom*, to avoid the Trouble and Anxiety attending it, and not because he apprehended there could be in this Life any Merit in Continency, or any Reward allotted for it in the next [m]. This Doctrine he broached in *Rome*, and soon found there a great Number of Followers, among the rest several of both Sexes, who had embraced, and professed for many Years, the State of Virginity, being seduced and misled, saith *Austin*, by the Cavils of that impious Wretch, asking them, whether they pretended to be more holy than *Abraham* and *Sarah*, than many other Men and Women, who, although married, are commended in the *Old Testament* for their eminent Sanctity [n]. The first, who took Offence at this Doctrine, were Two Laymen, *viz. Pammachius* and *Victorinus*. All we know of the latter is, that he was illustrious for his Birth, and, if we believe *Ambrose*, venerable for his Piety [o]. As for *Pammachius*, he is well known in the History of the Church, and often mentioned by *Jerom* with the greatest Commendations. He was descended, saith that Writer, from the antient Family of the *Camilli*, and yet less distinguished by the Nobility of his Descent than his Piety [p]. Having heard, by Chance, some of the Propositions advanced by *Jovinian*, he made it his Business to enquire more narrowly into his Doctrine, being assisted therein by *Victorinus*, who had taken the Alarm upon hearing, in *Rome*, this *shocking Doctrine*, saith *Jerom* [q], that *a Virgin was no better than a married Woman*. These Two having, by a diligent Inquiry, discovered at length the whole Doctrine of *Jovinian*, as well as the Author and Promoters of it, they presented a Request to *Syricius*, acquainting him therewith, and desiring, that the Doctrine of *Jovinian* might be condemned by the Episco-

[m] Amb. ibid. [n] Aug. hæres. 82. Hier. in Jovin. l. 2. c. 23.
[o] Amb. ep. 6. [p] Hier. ep. 26. [q] Id. ep. 50.

Epiſcopal Authority, and the Sentence of the *Holy Ghoſt*, as contrary to the Law of God[r]. Theſe are *Ambroſe*'s Words, as the Text now is; but it is generally thought to have been altered and corrupted. Be that as it will, *Syricius* did not take upon him to act on this Occaſion by his private Authority; but, aſſembling the Prieſts, Deacons, and other Eccleſiaſtics of *Rome*, he read to them the Requeſt of *Pammachius* and *Victorinus*, and having together with them, maturely examined the Doctrine of *Jovinian*, he declared it, with the unanimous Conſent of the whole Aſſembly, contrary to Scripture; and at the ſame time cut off, for ever, from the Communion of the Church, not only *Jovinian*, who had firſt broached ſuch a Doctrine, but thoſe among his Followers, who were found to have been the moſt ſanguine in promoting it; *viz.* *Auxentius*, *Genialis*, *Germinator*, *Felix*, *Frontinus*, *Martianus*, *Januarius*, and *Ingenius*[s]. *Jovinian*, inſtead of acquieſcing to the Judgment of *Syricius*, and his Clergy, immediately left *Rome*, and repaired with all Speed to *Milan*, not deſpairing of being able to engage *Ambroſe* in his Favour, and likewiſe the Emperor *Theodoſius*, who was then in that City, before *Syricius* could prejudice them againſt him. Of this *Syricius* was aware, and therefore, without Loſs of Time, diſpatched Three of his Preſbyters to *Milan*, *Creſcentius*, *Leopardus* and *Alexander*, with a Letter to that Church, which hath been tranſmitted to us among *Ambroſe*'s Works[t]. acquainting them with what had paſſed at *Rome*. In virtue of this Letter they were rejected by *Ambroſe*; and, at the Requeſt of Three *Roman* Preſbyters, driven out of the Town by the Emperor (A).

The Doctrine of Jovinian *condemned by a Council at* Rome.

The

[r] Amb. ep. 6. [s] Idem ibid. [t] Id. ep. 7.

(A) *Baronius* pretendeth it was on this Occaſion that *Theodoſius* enacted the Law, dated from *Verona* the 3d of *September* of the preſent Year 390, commanding all who profeſſed a monaſtic Life, to quit the Cities, and retire, purſuant to their Profeſſion, into the

The Letter of *Syricius* was answered by *Ambrose*, and signed by him, and several other Bishops, who were still at *Milan*, where they had met to condemn *Ithacius*, and his Adherents, for having been accessary to the Death of *Priscillian*. In their Answer they commend the Pastoral Vigilance of *Syricius*, and, having briefly declared their Opinion against the other Tenets of *Jovinian*, dwell on what he had advanced against the Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*. But they seem to have mistaken his Meaning, in charging him with *Manicheism*, and supposing him to have held, that our Saviour did not assume a real Body: for he held no such Doctrine, but only charged the Catholics with it, as *Austin* telleth us in express Terms [u]. It is surprising, that such a Question should have thus employed the Thoughts and Attention of so many venerable Prelates, and created such Feuds and Animosities in the Church. Both Parties agreed, that the Virgin *Mary* had brought forth her Son without the Co-operation or Intercourse of Man; and in that Sense alone she is styled a Virgin.

Law enacted against Jovinian, *and his Followers.*

From *Milan*, *Jovinian* returned to the Neighbourhood of *Rome*, where his Followers continued to assemble, under his Direction, until the Year 398, when the Emperor *Honorius*, giving Ear to the Complaints of the neighbouring Bishops, enacted a Law, commanding him and his Accomplices to be beaten with Whips armed with Lead, and transported into different Islands [w]. *Jovinian* himself was confined to the Isle of *Boas*, on the Coast of *Dalmatia* [x], where he gave up the Ghost, about the Year 406, in the midst of the Mirth and Jollity of a Banquet, saith *Jerom*,

[u] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 2. [w] Cod. Theod. 16. t. 5. l. 53.
[x] Hier. in Vigil. c. 1.

the Deserts (1). But that it was made on a very different Occasion, it will fall in my way to shew hereafter.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 390. n. 47, 48.

Jerom, adding, that he was revived in *Vigilantius*, as *Euphorbus* was formerly in *Pythagoras* y. Some of *Jerom*'s Friends in *Rome* ſent him the Book, which *Jovinian* had compoſed to explain and defend his Doctrine, begging him to confute it. He readily complied with their requeſt, and ended his Work in the Year 392. It conſiſted of Two Books, but met with a very indifferent Reception at *Rome*. For although he declared from the Beginning, that it was not his Intention to condemn Marriage and that he had an utter Abhorrence to the Errors of *Marcion*, of *Tatian*, and the *Manichees*, holding Marriage to be ſinful; yet the diſparaging Terms he made uſe of in ſpeaking of Marriage, gave great Offence, even to thoſe who profeſſed Continency (A).

Notwithſtanding the Severity of the Law I have mentioned above, ſome ſtill continued to hold, and privately to propagate, the Doctrine of *Jovinian*, which induced *Auſtin* to compoſe his Treatiſe on the Advantages of Marriage and Virginity; a Performance far more judicious than that of *Jerom*, who hath taken great Pains to diſparage and cry down Marriage the better to extol Virginity, as if he could not commend the one without condemning the other. *Auſtin*, on the contrary, beginneth his Work with great Encomiums on Matrimony, to which, how

y Hier. in Vigil. c. 1.

(A) This induced *Pammachius* to purchaſe all the Copies of it he could get, and ſend them back to the Author, acquainting him in a friendly manner with what had chiefly given Offence (1). This *Jerom* took as a Token of the moſt ſincere Friendſhip; and therefore, not ſatisfied with acknowledging the Obligation he had laid on him, and commending his Conduct as worthy of his great Prudence, and anſwerable to the Affection which it was owing to, he immediately ſet about the Apology which *Pammachius* had adviſed him to write, and inſcribed it to him (2).

(1) Ex Ruff. p. 231. & ep. 52. (2) Hier. ep. 51, 52.

however commendable, in the End he preferreth Virginity. But after all, the Reasons alledged by the one as well as the other, are, if duly weighed, but empty and unconclusive Speculations.

New Disturbances in the Church of Antioch.

The following Year, 391, a great Council was convened at *Capua*, chiefly with a View to restore Peace to the Church of *Antioch*, and put an End to the Schism, which had long prevailed there, and had occasioned almost an intire Separation between the East and the West, as I have related elsewhere[a]. *Paulinus*, who was acknowledged for lawful Bishop of that City by Part of the Catholicks there, by the Bishops of *Egypt*, *Arabia*, *Cyprus*, by the Bishop of *Rome*, and all the Western Bishops, died about the Year 388[b]. But the unhappy Division, which had reigned during his Life, continued to reign even after his Death. For *Paulinus*, by a most unaccountable Conduct, and a most notorious and open Violation of the Canons, took upon him not only to appoint himself a Successor before he died, but to ordain him alone. The Person whom he thus both named and ordained, was one *Evagrius*, a Presbyter, with whom he had always lived in close Friendship[c]; and who, on that account was, notwithstanding his illegal Election and Ordination, acknowleged by *Paulinus*'s Party for Bishop of *Antioch*. *Theodoret* writes, that the Bishop of *Rome*, with the other Western Bishops, and those of *Egypt*, embraced his Communion[d]. But *Ambrose* assureth us, that the Bishops of *Egypt* stood neuter, suspending all Communication both with *Evagrius*, and his Competitor *Flavianus*; and speaketh in such a manner of both, as giveth us room to suppose that he himself communicated with neither. *Both rely more on the Invalidity of their Competitor's Ordination*, saith he, *than on the Validity of their own. It is therefore with*

[a] Vide p. 293. [b] Soz. l. 5. c. 15. & l. 7. c. 15. Hier. vir ill. c. 125. [c] Theod. l. 5. c. 25. [d] Theod. ibid.

with Reaſon that Flavianus *declineth a fair Trial, and not without Reaſon* Evagrius *doth not demand one*[e]. The Example of *Ambroſe* was, in all Likelihood, followed by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the other Weſtern Biſhops; or *Ambroſe*, perhaps, conformed to theirs (A).

All the Biſhops of *Illyricum*, upon the Death of *Paulinus*, admitted *Flavianus*, and not *Evagrius*, to their Communion, if we may depend upon *Theodoret*[f]. As this new Election occaſioned unheard-of Diſturbances in the Church of *Antioch*, as the Diviſion ſtill continued between the Eaſt and the Weſt, the Weſtern Biſhops had frequent Recourſe to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, during the Three Years he paſſed in the Weſt, preſſing him to oblige, by his Imperial Authority, both *Flavianus* and *Evagrius* to ſubmit their Cauſe to the Judgment of a Council, that ſhould be held in *Italy*. *Theodoſius* conſented at laſt to their Requeſt, named *Capua* for the Place where the Council ſhould meet, and took upon him to oblige *Flavianus* to repair thither at the Time appointed. Soon after, that is, about the 14th of *July* 391, he left *Italy*, where he had continued ever ſince the Year 388, ſettling young *Valentinian* on the Throne, and ſet out for *Conſtantinople*, into which City he made his Entry on the 10th of *November*. Before his Departure from *Italy* he had wrote to *Flavianus*, commanding him to repair to *Conſtantinople*,

[e] Amb. ep. 9. [f] Theod. ib.

(A) A modern Writer will have it by all means, that *Syricius* communicated with *Evagrius* (1), becauſe he had always oppoſed *Flavianus*, as his Predeceſſors had done. But ſurely from his eſpouſing the Cauſe of *Paulinus*, who was legally choſen, againſt *Flavianus*, whoſe Election was conteſted, we cannot well conclude, that, in Oppoſition to him, he likewiſe took the Part of one whoſe Election was indiſputably illegal. It is far more probable, that he communicated with neither.

(1) M. Launoy, ep. 7. p. 10.

nople, and wait his Arrival there. *Flavianus* readily complied with the Emperor's Orders, and appeared at Court the Day after his Arrival. But when the Prince acquainted him with the Promise he had made to the Western Bishops, and desired him to prepare for the Journey, which he did in a very obliging manner, *Flavianus* represented to him the Inconveniencies attending so long a Journey at that Season of the Year, and begged he would give him Leave to put it off to the Spring, when he would not fail to obey his Orders. The Emperor, seeing him stricken in Years, thought the Excuse just and reasonable; and therefore, out of Compassion and Good-nature, allowed him for the present to return to his See [g]. Thus did *Flavianus*, by the Indulgence of the Emperor, avoid the Judgment of the Western Bishops, who wisely forbore meddling with so nice a Subject in his Absence, although his Competitor was present.

The Council of Capua.

The Council of *Capua* met in the Latter-end of the Year 319, and was, it seemeth, a very numerous Assembly, since it is styled, in the Canons of the Church of *Africa*, *a full Council* [h]. But whether it was composed of all the Western Bishops, or only of the Bishops of *Italy*, is uncertain, and cannot be determined from the Words of *Ambrose*, *We all met* [i], which may be equally understood of both. As the Acts of this Council have not reached our Times, we do not even know who presided at it, some conferring that Honour on *Ambrose* [k], some on *Syricius* [l], and some on both [m]. That *Syricius* presided, or even assisted, in Person, is not at all probable; for in the Times I am now writing of, the Bishops of *Rome* had begun to affect Grandeur; and, under Pretence that their Presence was necessary in the great

[g] Idem ibid. & Amb. 9. [h] Concil. t. 2. p. 1072. [i] Amb. ep. 9. [k] Laun. ep. 7. 10. [l] Bar. ad ann. 391. [m] Blond. primaut. p. 237.

great Metropolis of the Empire, to assist or preside in Councils held elsewhere by their Deputies or Legates, as they are now styled. That *Syricius* assisted, by his Deputies, at the Council of *Capua*, I do not doubt, since the Council was composed, at least, of all the Bishops of *Italy*, and *Syricius* owned himself bound by their Decrees [z]. But that *Ambrose* presided, seemeth undeniable, since by him, and him alone, the Whole was conducted and managed (A).

The Council avoided deciding, and even taking into Consideration, the Affair of *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, in the Absence of the former, although they had chiefly met for that Purpose. However, to re-establish the Tranquillity of the Church, they agreed to renew their Correspondence with, and grant their Communion to, all the Catholic Bishops of the East.

The Difference between the Two Competitors to the See of Antioch referred, by the Council, to the Bishops of Egypt.

As for the Difference between the Two Competitors for the See of *Antioch*, they committed the discussing and deciding of it to *Theophylus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and the other Bishops of *Egypt*, as the most proper Judges, since they communicated with neither, and therefore could not be suspected to favour the one more than the other [a]. The Bishop of *Alexandria* immediately acquainted *Flavianus* with the Resolution of the Council, summoning him, at the same time, to appear, in Compliance therewith, before the Bishops of *Egypt*, who were soon to assemble, in order to put the Decree of that venerable Assembly in Execution. But *Flavianus*, instead of obeying the Summons, and paying the Regard that was thought due to the Decree of so numerous a Council, refused to stir from *Antioch*, pleading a Rescript, which he had

Flavianus refuseth to comply with the Decree of the Council.

[z] Amb. ep. 9. [a] Id. ib.

(A) *Baronius*, without the least Foundation in History, supposeth *Ambrose* to have acted as the Pope's Legate. But it is the Custom of that Writer to vest every eminent and distinguished Prelate with the Legatine Dignity on such Occasions, and then pass upon his Readers the Deference and Regard shewn to their Merit for a Tribute paid to the Bishops of *Rome*.

had extorted from *Theodosius*, commanding the Western Bishops to repair into the East, and there examine the Affair in a new Council. This *Theophylus* did not expect, and therefore being at a Loss how to conduct himself on such an Emergency, he gave *Ambrose* immediate Notice of the Summons he had sent, and the Answer he had received. *Ambrose* had nothing so much at Heart as to restore Peace and Tranquillity to the Church of *Antioch*; and from the Regard which the Council had shewn to *Flavianus*, as well as the Impartiality with which they had acted with respect to both, he had promised himself Success in so pious an Undertaking. It was therefore with the utmost Concern that he saw his Endeavours thus unexpectedly defeated, and all Hopes of accomplishing what he had undertaken, vanish at once. He had but too much Reason to resent such an affronting Conduct, which did not so much affect the Council in general, as him in particular, since it was at his Motion, that the Council took the above-mentioned Resolution. That, however, did not tempt him to depart from the Neutrality he had embraced, and declare for *Evagrius:* he still maintained the same Impartiality, and refused to communicate with either. In his Answer to *Theophylus*, he desireth him, without betraying the least Emotion of Anger or Resentment, to summon *Flavianus* once more, directing him, at the same time, to communicate with all the Catholic Bishops of the East, pursuant to the Decree of the Council, whether he complied with this Second Summons or no; and to acquaint the Bishop of *Rome* with what he had done, that, the Whole being approved by that Church, as he did not question but it would, the whole Church might be happily of one Mind, and reap the Fruit of his Labour[b].

Ambrose's *Moderation and Impartiality.*

Syricius *writeth to the Emperor.*

Syricius, and in all Likelihood *Ambrose* too, wrote to *Theodosius*, pressing him to send *Flavianus* to *Rome*

[b] Idem ibid.

Rome (B), if he did not approve of his being judged by the Biſhop of *Alexandria*. *Syricius*, in his Letter, tells the Emperor, that he well knew how to deal with Tyrants, who revolted from him, and how to chaſtiſe them; but ſuffered thoſe to go unpuniſhed, who deſpiſed the Laws of *Chriſt*[c] (C).

Theodoſius, in Compliance with the Requeſt of *Syricius*, made in the Name of all the Weſtern Biſhops, ſent anew for *Flavianus*, and told him, that he muſt, by all means, either repair to *Rome*, or ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of the Biſhops of *Egypt*. But he was determined, ſaith *Theodoret*, to relinquiſh his Dignity rather than to ſuffer the Weſtern Biſhops, or thoſe of *Egypt*, to examine and decide whether he had a Right to it or no; and, by that means, to hold it of them. He therefore anſwered the Emperor, with great Calmneſs and Reſpect, in the following Terms: *Sir, if my Faith is not thought Orthodox, or my Conduct not worthy of a Catholic Biſhop, I am willing to be judged by thoſe who accuſe me, and ready to ſubmit to the Sentence they ſhall pronounce. But if all this Noiſe is made merely for the ſake of my Dignity, from this Moment I reſign every Preferment I enjoy in the Church, to thoſe whom nothing but Preferment can ſilence. You may therefore diſpoſe of the See of* Antioch, *now vacant, to whom you pleaſe.* *Theodoſius*, pleaſed with this Anſwer, and thinking *Flavianus*, the more ready he was to give up his Dignity, the more worthy to hold it, ordered him to return to *Antioch*, and reſume the Government of his Church; nor did he ever afterwards give the leaſt Atten-

Flavianus *ready to reſign his Dignity, rather than to ſubmit to the Judgement of the* Egyptian *or Weſtern Biſhops.*

[c] Theod. l. 5. c. 23.

(B) That is, in the Weſt; for thus *Theodoret* conſtantly expreſſes the Weſt.

(C) *Theodoret* telleth us, that *Damaſus*, *Syricius*, and *Anaſtaſius* the Succeſſor of *Syricius*, wrote to the Emperor *Theodoſius* about the Diſpute between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*. A groſs Miſtake! ſince *Damaſus* was dead long before the Election of *Evagrius*, and *Theodoſius* before that of *Anaſtaſius*.

Attention to the preſſing and repeated Inſtances of *Syricius*, and his Collegues in the Weſt [d].

Flavianus *did not acknowlege in* Syricius *the Power claimed by his Succeſſors.*

From the whole Conduct of *Flavianus* it is manifeſt, that he did not acknowledge any extraordinary Power in *Syricius*, much leſs that Power, which hath been claimed by his Succeſſors, of diſpoſing, by Divine Right, of all Biſhopricks, of placing and diſplacing Biſhops, at Pleaſure, throughout the Chriſtian World. This Power, although evidently uſurped, and uterly unknown even in the End of the Fourth Century. Biſhops are now obliged to own in their very Titles, ſtyling themſelves Biſhop of ſuch a Place. *By the Grace of God, and of the Apoſtolic See. Flavianus* was content with *the Grace of God*; and, as for the *Grace of the Apoſtolic See*, he gave himſelf no Trouble about it. And yet *Flavianus* is honoured by the Church of *Rome* as a Saint; and his Feſtival kept on the 26th of *September*. And truly, if we may depend upon the Teſtimony of the moſt authentic and unexceptionable Writers of thoſe Times, we ſhall hardly find one in the *Roman* Calendar more worthy of that Honour. The famous *John Chryſoſtom*, who was one of his Preſbyters before his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople*, hath filled his Homilies with the Praiſes of *the great Flavianus*, as he ſtyleth him. His diſtinguiſhed Merit, eminent Virtues, and extraordinary Piety, ſeem to have been *Chryſoſtom*'s favourite Topic; and theſe Encomiums he beſtowed upon him, while he was ſtill alive. After his Death he was diſtinguiſhed by the Council of *Chalcedon*, with the Title of *the bleſſed Flavianus* [e]: and by that of the Eaſt, held under *John* of *Antioch*, ranked among the brighteſt Luminaries, the moſt illuſtrious Prelates, and the greateſt Saints of the Church [f]. *Theodoret* never nameth him without adding to his Name ſome Epithet, denoting his extraordinary Merit,

[d] Idem ib. [e] Concil. t. 4. p. 830. [f] Facund. Hermian. l. 8. c. 1.

rit, ſuch as *the great*, *the holy*, *the admirable* Flavianus. As therefore no room is left to doubt of his extraordinary Piety and Merit, we may well conclude, from his abſolutely refuſing to ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of *Syricius*, and the other Biſhops of the Weſt, that he did not acknowlege either in him or them a Power to judge him. This Refuſal did not, in the Eyes of *Chryſoſtom* and other great Men, detract in the leaſt from his Merit, nor leſſen the high Opinion they entertained of his Sanctity. A plain Indication that they did not think his Conduct reprehenſible, and conſequently did not acknowledge, more than he, that Power which is now one main Article of the *Roman Catholic Creed.*

The Communion between the East and the West renewed.

As *Flavianus* declined the Judgment of the *Weſtern* as well as the *Egyptian* Biſhops, and the Emperor gave no farther Ear to their Remonſtrances and Complaints, the Reſolution taken by the Council of *Capua* was put in Execution; which was to renew the Communion and good Underſtanding between the Eaſt and the Weſt, and abandon the Church of *Antioch* to its Schiſm, which, after ſo many promiſing Remedies applied in vain, began now to be deemed an incurable Evil [g].

Bonoſus accuſed before the Council.

The Council of *Capua*, after the above-mentioned Reſolution concerning the Difference between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, heard a Charge brought by ſome Biſhops againſt *Bonoſus*, Biſhop of *Naiſſus* in *Dacia*, according to ſome, or, as others will have it, of *Sardica*, the Metropolis of that Province. He was accuſed of a Crime againſt the Canons of the Church and the Law of God [h], and likewiſe of Hereſy. The Crime is not ſpecified; but as for the Hereſy, I gather from *Auſtin*, that he held the Son to be inferior to the Father [i]; and from *Ambroſe*, that he taught, the Virgin *Mary* had had other Children

His Errors.

[g] Ruff. l. 11. c. 22. [h] Mercat. t. 2. p. 128. [i] Auguſt. ep. 150.

dren after the Birth of *Christ*[k]. He had, it seemeth, been condemned by *Damasus*, who died in 384[l], but still held his See, and was not driven from it even by the Council of *Capua*. For the Fathers of that Assembly committed the hearing and judging of his Cause to the Bishops of his Neighbourhood, chiefly to those of *Macedon*, under their Metropolitan *Anysius*, Bishop of *Thessalonica*[m]. The neighbouring Bishops assembled, pursuant to the Order of the Council; and *Bonosus*, as well as his Accusers, appearing before them, they found the Charge so well supported, that they immediately forbid him to enter his Church; which was suspending him from all Episcopal Function. *Bonosus* complained loudly of this Sentence, and even advised with the Bishop of *Milan*, whether he might not, in Defiance of a Judgment so rash and immature, still exercise the Functions of his Office, and, in case of Opposition, repel Force with Force. *Ambrose* exhorted him, in the strongest Terms, to acquiese to the Sentence, to conduct himself with the Prudence. Temper, and Moderatiou, that became a Bishop; and, above all, not to undertake any thing that might be interpreted as a Contempt of the Authority of his Judges, since he could not contemn their Authority, without contemning at the same time that of the Council which had appointed them[n]. In the mean time the Bishops of *Macedon*, having more leisurely examined the Cause of *Bonosus*, wrote to *Syricius*, referring the Decision to him, and declare their *Abhorence of the detestable Error, that the Virgin* Mary *had other Children besides Christ*. If this was an Error, which may well be doubted, it was one which did no-way affect the Christian Faith, and therefore did not deserve such a severe Condemnation: but as it thwarted the favourable Opinion then entertained in

The judging of his Cause committed by the Council to the neighbouring Bishops who condemn him.

[k] Amb. ep. 5. & Instit. Virg. p. 5. [l] Merc. ib. [m] Amb. ib. [n] Id. ib.

in the Church concerning Virginity, it is no Wonder that it ſhould meet with ſo rough a Treatment (A).

Syricius, in his Anſwer to the Biſhop of *Macedon*, approves their Sentiments; and employeth almoſt his whole Letter to ſhew, that the Virgin *Mary* was always a Virgin: but as for the Cauſe of *Bonoſus*, he tells them, that *it was not lawful for him to judge it, ſince that Province had been committed to them by the Council*

(A) That the Virgin *Mary* had other Children beſides Chriſt, was not a new Opinion. It was taught by *Helvidius* in 383, and long before him by *Tertullian*, and *Jerom* himſelf is forced to own in the Treatiſe which he wrote againſt *Helvidius*: nay, in the Time of *Epiphanius*, who flouriſhed from the Year 366, to 403, that Opinion univerſally prevailed in *Arabia*, as appeareth from the Letter which he wrote in Confutation of it, and addreſſed to all the Chriſtians dwelling in *Arabia*, from the Preſbyters down to the Catechumens. In that Letter he ſtyles thoſe who denied the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*, *Antidicomarianites*; and ranks them, although their Opinion had not yet been condemned by the Church, ſometimes among the Heretics, and ſometimes among the Schiſmatics. But in the ſame Letter he cenſureth, with no leſs Severity, thoſe who adored her, ſtyling the Worſhip that was paid her *an idolatrous Hereſy*, which was taxing thoſe who paid it both with Hereſy and Idolatry; and from neither will the unmeaning Terms of *Latria*, *Dulia*, *Huperdulia*, &c. invented and uſed by the Schoolmen to expreſs different Degrees of Worſhip, excuſe the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome*. *Epiphanius* was unacquainted with ſuch Terms, as well as with the different Degrees of Worſhip anſwering them; and therefore called the Meeting of certain Women, on a ſtated Day, to offer a Cake to the Virgin *Mary*, and eat it together in her Honour, (whence they had the Name of *Collyridians*) *a Folly repugnant to Religion, an Illuſion of the Devil, a robbing God of the Honour that was due to him, an idolatrous Hereſy* (1). Theſe Women came from the Northern Provinces of *Scythia* into *Thrace*, probably about the Year 372, when *Athanaric* King of the *Goths* drove all the Chriſtians out of his Dominions. From *Thrace* they wandered into *Arabia*; and there, in Oppoſition to the *Antidicomarianites*, introduced the above-mentioned idolatrous Practice. This is the firſt Inſtance of any Worſhip paid to the Virgin *Mary*; and to thoſe Women the extravagant Worſhip that is ſtill paid her by the Church of *Rome* oweth its Riſe. Some of

(1) Epiph. hær. 78, 79.

Council at Capua °. And was not this disclaiming, in the most plain and explicit Terms he possibly could, that Power which his Successors challenge, and have almost overturned the Christian Religion to maintain (A)?

Bonosus exerciseth the Episcopal Functions after his Condemnation.

As *Syricius* declined the judging of *Bonosus*, his Cause was in the End decided, and he condemned by *Anysius*, and the other Bishops, to whom that Judgment had been committed by the Council of *Capua*.

° Amb. ibid.

of these Women took upon them to act, at their Meetings, as Priestesses. This *Epiphanius* styleth an abominable Abuse, Women being so utterly incapable, saith he, of performing any Ecclesiastical Functions, that our Saviour did not grant even to his Mother the Power of baptizing (9).

(A) Such a Letter, we may be sure, hath not been tamely received by the Partisans of *Rome*. Some of them have rejected it as forged and surreptitious, for no other Reason, but because *Syricius* is there made to disclaim a Power which he undoubtedly had. But this is evidently begging the Question (1). Others, finding it conveyed to us amongst *Ambrose*'s Letters, have ascribed it to him, by prefixing his Name to it. But *Ambrose* is unluckily named, and spoken of, in the Body of the Letter: whence *Baronius* himself alloweth it not to be his (2). The Style afforded great Matter of Dispute, some thinking it like, and others unlike, to the Style of *Syricius*; but more than the Style, the Title; *To* Theophylus *and* Anysius. The former was Bishop of *Alexandria*: And how came he to be any ways concerned in the Cause of *Bonosus*? If that Name was common to him with some Bishops of *Macedon*, how came that Bishop to be named before *Anysius* his Metropolitan (3)? In the Height of these Disputes, *Holstenius* published the above-mentioned Letter at *Rome*, under the Name of *Syricius*, from a very antient and authentic Manuscript, with the following Title, *To* Anysius *and the other Bishops of* Illyricum (4). This turned the Controversy into another Chanel; for the Dispute was no more concerning the Authenticity, but the Sense, of the Letter, which the Sticklers for the See of *Rome* began to think very different from the Sense that the Words of *Syricius* had conveyed to them before; nay, those who had rejected the Letter as spurious, for no other Reason but because *Syricius*

(9) Idem ibid. (1) David. p. 562, 563. (2) Bar. ad ann. 389. n. 76. (3) Vid. Blond. primaut. p. 236. (4) Holst. coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 189.

Capua. It was at the ſame time decreed, that thoſe who had been ordained by him after the firſt Sentence, that is, after his Suſpenſion, ſhould retain the Degrees to which he had raiſed them. This Indulgence was ſhewn, as is declared in the Decree, contrary to the common Rule, *on Account of the preſent Neceſſity*; that is, leſt they ſhould adhere to *Bonoſus*, and form a Schiſm [p]. *Bonoſus*, although thus condemned, continued to exerciſe the Epiſcopal Functions, and, holding ſeparate Aſſemblies, to ordain, without Examination or Diſtinction, all who preſented themſelves to him: nay, he is even charged with dragging ſome by open Force to his Conventicle, and ordaining them there againſt their Will [q]: a kind of Rape never heard of before. What Advantage he could propoſe to himſelf or others in ſo doing, we are not told, and it is not eaſy to gueſs. The Biſhops of *Macedon* allowed even thoſe, who were thus ordained, to keep their reſpective Degrees in the Catholic Church, upon their only receiving the Benediction of a lawful Biſhop. Hence thoſe, who found themſelves excluded by the Church from holy Orders, on account of their ſcandalous Lives, applied

He ordaineth ſome by Force.

[p] Concil. t. 2. p. 1274. [q] Ib. p. 1275.

cius was there made to diſown a Power, which he undoubtedly had, were not aſhamed to maintain, that he diſowned no ſuch Power. Some of them have a particular Faculty or Talent at making Authors ſay what they never thought or dreamt of; nay, at making them affirm what they flatly deny, and deny what they poſitively affirm. But they have not been ſo ſucceſsful on this as on ſeveral other Occaſions. The Words of *Syricius* are too plain and preciſe to admit of any plauſible, or even probable, Miſinterpretation. To avoid therefore the tireſome and unneceſſary Taſk of confuting the forced Interpretations they have put on the Words of *Syricius*, I refer the Reader to his Letter, which is the Fifth amongſt *Ambroſe*'s Letters; and leave him to judge, whether it was poſſible for him to diſclaim, in Terms leſs liable to Miſinterpretations, the Power of judging a Cauſe committed by a Council to the Judgment of others, which was diſclaiming, in other Words, that univerſal Juriſdiction, which his Succeſſors have uſurped, and pretend to exerciſe by Divine Right.

applied to *Bonosus*, pretending to espouse his Party, but left him as soon as they had obtained the Degree they wanted [t]. *Bonosus* died about the Year 410, but his Doctrine did not die with him, being maintained by some Two hundred Years after his Death (B).

An End put to the Schism of Antioch.

Syricius had, in the last Year of his Life, the Satisfaction of seeing an End put at length to the Schism of *Antioch*, of which I have had so frequent Occasion speak to; and the East and West, after so long a Misunderstanding, or rather Separation, happily reunited. This great Work was accomplished in the following manner: *Evagrius*, the Successor of *Paulinus*, dying not long after his Promotion, *Flavianus* employed all the Credit and Interest he had at Court, and with the Clergy of *Antioch*, to prevent the Election of a new Bishop in the room of the deceased: and so far his Endeavours proved successful. But he could by no means gain the *Eustathians*, who continued to assemble apart, or prevail either upon the Bishops of *Egypt*, or *Syricius*, and the other Western Bishops, to admit him to their Communion, although he had no Competitor, whose Cause they would espouse against him. Thus, through the inflexible

[t] Ibidem.

(B) His Followers were known by the Name of *Bonosiacs* or *Bonosians*; and mention is made of them by Pope *Gregory*, towards the Latter-end of the Sixth Century (1). That Pope writeth, as doth likewise *Gennadius* (2), that the Church rejected their Baptism, because they did not baptize in the Name of the Three Divine Persons. But the Council of *Arles*, held in 452, by the Saventeenth Canon, commands the *Bonesians* to be recieved into the Church by the holy Unction, the Imposition of Hands, and a Confession of Faith, *it being certain, that they baptize in the Name of the Trinity (3)*. It is to be observed, that several Writers have confounded the *Bonosians* with the *Photinians*, who did not baptize in the Name of the three Persons; and by them both *Gregory* and *Gennadius* were misled (4),

(1) Gregor. l. 9. ep. 61. (2) Idam ibid. Genn. dog. c. 52. (3) Avit. frag. p. 181. (4) Vide Concil. t. 2. p. 1270. & t. 3. p. 663. & t. 4. p. 1013.

flexible Obſtinacy of the *Egyptian* and Weſtern Biſhops, was Diſcord kept alive, and a kind of Schiſm fomented among the Prelates and Members of the Catholic Church, ſaith *Sozomen*[r]. In this Situation Affairs continued from the Year 392, in which *Evagrius* died, to the Year 398, when the famous *John Chryſoſtom*, Preſbyter of the Church of *Antioch*, was, in regard of his extraordinary Merit, preferred to the See of *Conſtantinople*. No ſooner was he placed in that high Station, than his generous Diſpoſition, above all little Piques and Jealouſies, his Zeal for the Welfare of the Church in general, and the tender Regard he had for that of *Antioch* in particular, prompted him to employ all the Credit and Authority, which his new Dignity gave him, in bringing about an intire Reconciliation between the Eaſt and the Weſt, and reſtoring the Church of *Antioch* to the Communion of thoſe Churches, from which it had been ſo long ſeparated[t]. *Chryſoſtom* had been conſecrated by *Theophylus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, whom the Council of *Capua* had appointed to decide, with the other Biſhops of *Egypt*, the Difference between *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, as I have related above. To him therefore, before he left *Conſtantinople* to return to *Egypt*, the new Biſhop of that City, impatient to ſee ſo great a Work brought to an happy Iſſue, imparted his Intention of attempting a Reconciliation between *Flavianus* and *Syricus* Biſhop of *Rome*, earneſtly intreating him to ſecond and promote with his Endeavours an Undertaking truly worthy of the two firſt Biſhops of the Eaſt.

Chryſoſtom *ſtudieth to reconcile the Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops.*

There had ſubſiſted a Miſunderſtanding between *Theophylus* and *Flavianus* ever ſince the Year 391, when the Council of *Capua* was held. *Flavianus* had refuſed to ſubmit his Cauſe to the Judgment of *Theophylus*, purſuant to the Reſolution of that Council; which he had highly reſented; and, in the Height of

Flavianus *and* Theophylus *reconciled.*

[r] Soz. l. 8. c. 3. [t] Theod. l. 5. c. 23. Soz. l. 8. c. 3.

of his Reſentment, as he was a Man of a fiery and choleric Temper, he had wrote to *Flavianus* in a very haughty and imperious Style. To theſe Letters *Neſtorius* no doubt alludeth, where he telleth us, that *Egypt* could not, by her menacing Letters, although written in the Style, and with all the Haughtineſs of an imperious Tyrant, move or terrify the bleſſed *Flavianus* [v]. It was neceſſary, in the firſt place, to remove the Miſunderſtanding which had ſo long ſubſiſted between theſe Two Prelates; and in this *Chryſoſtom* met with no Difficulty or Obſtruction, *Theophylus* readily acquieſcing to the Terms he propoſed in the Name of *Flavianus*, and *Flavianus* ratifying them, upon the firſt notice, without the leaſt Exception or Limitation. What theſe Terms were, we are no-where told; but it is certain, that, all Diſputes being thereby compoſed, the Biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* were intirely reconciled, and the Communion between them renewed, to the great Satisfaction of both [w].

Chryſoſtom attempteth a Reconciliation between Flavianus *and* Syricius.

The next Thing to be attempted, and, as was apprehended, the moſt difficult to be accompliſhed, was the reconciling of *Syricius* with the Biſhop of *Antioch*, who had now held that See Seventeen Years, but had not been able, notwithſtanding the great Character he bore, to obtain the Communion of *Syricius*, or any of his Predeceſſors, on account of their ſtrong Prejudice againſt him, as well as his Predeceſſor *Meletius*, and their obſtinate Attachment to the contrary Party, in Oppoſition to the far greater Part of the Eaſtern Biſhops. But the Zeal of *Chryſoſtom* was Proof againſt all Difficulties. Not deſpairing therefore of Succeſs, he took the moſt effectual Means a conſummate Prudence could dictate, to obtain it, adviſing the Biſhops of *Antioch* and *Alexandria* to acquaint the Biſhop of *Rome*, by a ſolemn Embaſſy, with their Reconciliation, and at the ſame time to beg, in the Name of *Flavianus*, the Communion

His prudent Conduct.

[n] Mar. t. 2. p. 86. [w] Socr. l. 5. c. 15.

munion of that See. This he knew would flatter the Vanity of *Syricius*, and be of more Weight than any Remonſtrances they could make. They readily fell in with the Propoſal, and Deputies were immediately choſen to put it in Execution. Theſe were *Acacius* Biſhop of *Beræa*, *Demetrius* of *Peſſinus*, and ſeveral other Biſhops, with *Iſidorus* Preſbyter and Hoſpitaler of the Church of *Alexandria*, and a great Number of Preſbyters and Deacons of the Church of *Antioch*. *Acacius*, who was at the Head of this Deputation, was charged by *Chryſoſtom* to preſent to *Syricius* the Decree of his Election to the See of *Conſtantinople* [x]. That ſo great an Honour might not be conferred in vain on the See of *Rome*, it was thought adviſable to acquaint *Syricius* with their Deſign, before they ſet out, and to be well aſſured of a kind Reception on their Arrival in the Weſt. They gave him accordingly early Notice of their Intention, and he, taken with the Bait, readily promiſed to ſettle every thing to their Satisfaction [y]; which he did accordingly, receiving them, on their Arrival at *Rome*, with the greateſt Marks of Reſpect and Eſteem, and admitting *Flavianus* to his Communion. From *Rome* the Deputies repaired into *Egypt*, where all the Biſhops, following the Example of *Theophylus* and *Syricius*, acknowledged *Flavianus* for lawful Biſhop of *Antioch*, and, aſſembling in Council, with great Solemnity, embraced his Communion. From *Egypt* the Deputies ſet out for *Antioch*, and there, by delivering to *Flavianus* Letters of Communion from the Weſtern and *Egyptian* Biſhops, completed the great Work, and with it their Deputation [z]. Thus was an End put, at laſt, to the Schiſm of *Antioch*; and, after ſo many Years of Strife and Contention, a perfect Harmony and good Under-

Syricius and Flavianus reconciled.

The Miſunderſtanding between the East and the West intirely removed.

[x] Sozom. lib. 8. c. 3. Socrat. lib. 6. c. 9. Pallad. dial. c. 4.
[y] Theod. l. 5. c. 23. [z] Soz. l. 5. c. 15. Theod. ib. Pallad. dial. p. 10.

Understanding were settled anew between the East and the West (A).

Flavianus *endeavoureth in vain to gain over the* Eustathians.

Flavianus, being thus at last in the Seventeenth Year of his Episcopacy, acknoledged by, and united in Communion with, all the Bishops of the Catholic Church, spread no Pains to gain over the *Eustathians*, that, by reuniting them to the rest of his Flock, he might

(A) If *Syricius* is to blame (and who, but *Baronius* can excuse him?) for not acknowleging *Flavianus*, at least after the Death of *Paulinus*, the Election of his Successor *Evagrius* being unquestionably uncanonical and illegal; how much more is he to blame for not acknowleging him even after the Death of *Evagrius*, when he had no Pretence whatsoever for denying him his Communion, and by granting it he might have put an End to the Schism? *Baronius*, to conceal the Truth, and mislead his Readers, to place in a false Light all the Transactions relating to it. But, in spite of all the Arts he hath been able to use, to varnish over the Conduct of *Syricius*, and impose on the Public, it must appear undeniable to every impartial, I may say, to every rational, Man, that the Schism, and the many Evils attending it which are pathetically described by *Chrysostom*, who was then at *Antioch* (1), were intiraly owing to the Pride and Obstinacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, at least during the last Six Years, that is, from the Year 382, when *Evagrius* died, to 388, when he yielded, at last, upon his being courted to it by a solemn Embassy. He had nothing then to object against the Election, and much less against the Conduct of *Flavianus*; and, if he had nothing then, he could have nothing before; so that it was merely from an haughty and obstinate Spirit that he refused to communicate with him, and, by such a Refusal, kept up and fomented a Division so pernicious to the Church. *Baronius* representeth him as labouring with indefatigable Pains to restore the Tranquility of the Church, and leaving nothing unattempted that could anyways contribute to the promoting of so pious an Undertaking, an Undertaking which he had so much at Heart. But that he had nothing at Heart besides the Glory of his See, is but too manifest from his Conduct; for the Minute that was saved, as it was by the above-mentioned Deputation, all the Difficulties vanished at once, which until then had obstructed the Work. As for the Conduct of *Flavianus*, in refusing to submit his Cause to the Judgment of the Council of *Capua*, or of the *Egyptian* Bishops, appointed to judge it by that Council, it must appear, if impartially considered, more worthy of Commendation than Blame, although

(1) Chrys. in Eph. hom. 11.

might have the Merit and Glory of eſtabliſhing an intire and laſting Tranquillity in the Church committed to his Care. But his Zeal was not therein attended with the wiſhed-for Succeſs. The Glory of completing ſo great and deſirable a Work was, by Providence, reſerved for *Alexander*, one of his Succeſſors, who had the Satisfaction of ſeeing all Party-

although condemned, in very unbecoming Terms, by the Sticklers for the See of *Rome*. He had been choſen by the Oecumenical Council of *Conſtantinople*, in the Year 381, by the unanimous Voice of all the Biſhops of the Dioceſe of the Eaſt, or the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, and ſoon after ordained in their Preſence, at *Antioch*, with the Approbation of *Neſtorius*, then Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and the loud Acclamations of the far greater Part of the People of *Antioch*, promiſing themſelves, in him, a ſecond *Meletius*, in whoſe room he was choſen (2). Being thus choſen and ordained, he was acknowleged by all the Biſhops of the Eaſt, except thoſe of *Egypt*, of the Iſland of *Cyprus*, and *Arabia*. Could he therefore, without ſhamefully betraying *the undoubted Right, which the Biſhops of each Dioceſe had of chuſing their Metropolitan*, ſuffer his Election to be queſtioned and canvaſſed by the Weſtern Biſhops, who had no Concern in it; and, beſides, had openly eſpouſed the Cauſe of his Competitor *Paulinus*, and ſupported him, ſo long as he lived, with the moſt open and avowed Partiality? Could he, without foregoing, in a manner ſtill more ſhameful, both his own Right, and that of his Electors, out of Compliance to the Biſhops aſſembled at *Capua*, put himſelf upon the Level with *Evagrius*, whoſe Election and Ordination were undoubtedly illegal? Beſides, *Flavianus* was ſenſible, that the Eaſtern Biſhops would have paid no manner of Regard to the Sentence of the Council; that, had the Council adjudged the See of *Antioch* to *Evagrius*, ſuch a Judgement, inſtead of cloſing, would have widened the Breach between the Eaſt and the Weſt; and conſequently, that his complying with their Summons, far from anſwering the End they propoſed to themſelves, would more probably have had a quite contrary Effect, ſince he had but too much room to ſuppoſe, that the ſtrong Prejudice which they had on all Occaſions betrayed againſt him, would incline them to favour his Competitor, notwithſtanding the known Illegality both of his Election and Ordination. It was therefore, upon the Whole, very prudent in him to decline putting the Affair upon that Iſſue.

(2) Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. l. 7. c. 3. Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Cod. Theod. ap. p. 104.

Party-Names laid aside, and the whole People of *Antioch* united in one Flock, under one and the same Shepherd. This Union was made with great Solemnity, in the Year 415, Eleven Years after the Death of *Flavianus*, and Eighty-five after the Beginning of the Schism. Thus *Theodoret*, in his Ecclesiastical History [a]. But *Theodorus* the Lector assureth us, that there still remained some Seeds of that unhappy Division until the Year 482, when the Body of *Eustathius* being brought back to *Antioch*, the few *Eustathians*, who still continued to assemble apart, joined the rest of the Catholics, and the Name of *Eustathian* was never more heard of [b]. *Flavianus* died in the Year 404, the Ninety-fifth of his Age, and Twenty-third of his Episcopacy, and is now honoured as a Saint; a Distinction which none of his Competitors have deserved, although as much caressed and favoured by the Two Bishops of *Rome*, *Damasus* and *Syricius*, as he was opposed and ill used. How fallible have the Bishops of that See shewed themselves, from the earliest Times, in their Judgement of things! How rash in taking Parties, and fomenting Discords! How obstinate and inflexible in maintaining the Cause, which they had once undertaken, let it be ever so bad! The only thing that can be alleged against the Character of *Flavianus*, is his having accepted the Bishoprick of *Antioch*, contrary to the Oath he had taken, on Occasion of the Agreement between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, as I have related above [c]. That he took such an Oath, is vouched both by *Socrates* and *Sozomen* [d]. But as he was looked upon by all the East, and extolled by *Chrysostom*, even in his Life-time, as a Prelate of an unblemished Character, and never reproached, even by his greatest Enemies, with such an Oath, in the many Disputes that arose about his Election, I had rather

Flavianus honoured by the Church of Rome as a Saint, though ill used in his Life time by the Popes.

[a] Theod. l. 5. c. 35. [b] Theod. Lect. l. 2. [c] Vid. p. 295.
[d] Socr. l. 5. c. 5. Soz. 7. c. 3.

rather charge those Writers with one Mistake more (for they are guilty of many others), than a Man of *Flavianus*'s Probity with such a scandalous Prevarication.

Syricius did not long enjoy the Satisfaction he had, to see the Schism of *Antioch* ended in his Days, and a good Understanding settled anew between the East and the West. He died the same Year 398, and, according to the most probable Opinion, on the 26th of *November* [e]. He is said, in his Epitaph, quoted by *Baronius* [f], to have been a Man of a tender, compassionate, and generous Temper; to have studied the Happiness of the People committed to his Care; to have spared no Pains in procuring them the Blessings that flow from Peace and Tranquillity, and to have screened several Persons from the Wrath of the Emperor, to maintain the Rights of the Church [g]. He is commended by *Ambrose*, and the whole Council of *Milan*, as *a vigilant Pastor* [g]; by *Isidore* of *Seville* as *an illustrious Pontiff* [h]; and he hath even a Place among the other Saints in most of the antient Martyrologies [i]. However, *Baronius* hath not thought him worthy of a Place in the *Roman* Martyrology. It is well known, that the Charge of reviſing and correcting the *Roman* Martyrology was committed, by Pope *Gregory* XIII. to *Baronius*, with full Power to reject such as he should judge unworthy, and admit others in their room, whom he should declare worthy of the public Worship, and a Place there (B).

Syricius *dies.*

Was once honoured as a Saint.

[e] Vide Bolland. 22 Feb p. 282. [f] Bar. ad ann. 398. in app. [g] Id. ib. [g] Amb. ep. 7. [h] Isid. vir. ill. c. 3. [i] Florent. p. 999. Bolland. Feb. 22. p. 282.

(B) The *Roman* Martyrology contains the Names of such Saints as may be publicly worshipped, and of the Places where they died, with a succinct Account of the most remarkable Feats which they are supposed to have performed. I said, *who are publicly worshipped*; for in private every one is allowed to honour, worship, and invoke whom they please, provided they have sufficient Grounds to believe them in *a State of Happiness*, or *in the Way*

The Keys of Heaven, ſaith a modern Writer, ſpeaking of that Charge, *were taken from* Peter, *and given to* Baronius; *for it was not by* Peter, *but by* Baronius, *that ſome were excluded from, and others admitted into, Heaven*[k]. He then ſheweth, that, by this *Second Minos*, as he ſtyleth him, ſeveral were driven from the Seats they had long held in Heaven, and to which they had a juſt Claim, to make room for others, who had no Claim. Among the former he nameth *Syricius*, whom he thinketh *Baronius* ought to have treated in a more friendly manner, upon the Recommendation of *Ambroſe*, of the Council of *Milan*, and of *Iſidore*. What thus prejudiced *Baronius* againſt him, and outweighed, in his Scales, all the Recommendations that could be produced in his Favour, was his Indifference for *Jerom* and *Paulinus*, and the Kindneſs he ſhewed to *Ruffinus*, *Jerom*'s Antagoniſt. *Syricius*, inſtead of protecting *Jerom*, as his Predeceſſor *Damaſus* had done, againſt the *Roman* Clergy, whom he had provoked with his Writings, gave him,

Why expunged by Baronius out of the Calendar of Saints.

[k] Aguilera Santi di Palermo.

Way to it, that is, in Heaven, or in Purgatory; for the Souls in Purgatory may be privately worſhipped, and invoked; nay, moſt of the Popiſh Divines are now of Opinion, that even a canonized Saint may be ſtill in Purgatory. When Learning began to revive, many groſs Miſtakes were diſcovered in the *Roman*, as well as in the other Martyrologies, ſome being placed among the Saints, and conſequently worſhipped as Saints, who had been notorious Sinners; and others daily invoked, who had never exiſted. That the Church therefore might be no longer miſled in her Worſhip, *Gregory* XIII. thought it neceſſary to interpoſe his *infallible Authority*; and having, accordingly, ordered *Baronius* to reviſe and correct the *Roman* Martyrology, he confirmed, by a ſpecial Bull, dated the 14th of *January* 1584, all the Emendations, Additions, Corrections, *&c.* which *Baronius* had been pleaſed to make, threatening with *the Indignation of the Almighty God, and of his Apoſtles St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, all who ſhould preſume to make any further Alterations. And yet many Alterations have been made ſince *Gregory*'s Time; and that many more might and ought to be made, hath been ſufficiently ſhewn by many Proteſtant, and ſome Roman Catholic, Divines.

him, in a manner, up to their Reſentment; which obliged him to abandon *Rome*, and return into the Eaſt, as I have related above. The Name of *Paulinus*, afterwards Biſhop of *Nola*, is famous in the Hiſtory of the Church, and celebrated by *Jerom*, *Ambroſe*, *Auſtin*, and all the Writers of thoſe Times. He had abandoned the World, and the immenſe Wealth he poſſeſſed, to lead a retired Life; and, in the Year 395, he paſſed through *Rome* in his Way to *Nola*, which he had choſen for the Place of his Retirement. The Treatment he met with at *Rome*, from that Clergy, and *Syricius* himſelf, muſt have been very unworthy of a Man of his Character, ſince it obliged him, as he himſelf writeth [l], to quit the City in great Haſte, and purſue his Journey to *Nola*. Two Years afterwards *Ruffinus* came to *Rome*, and there met with a very different Reception. For *Syricius* received him, although violently ſuſpected of *Origeniſm*, with the greateſt Marks of Eſteem and Affection; and, after having entertained him a whole Year, gave him Letters of Communion at his Departure. Of this *Jerom* complaineth, as if Advantage had been taken of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Simplicity, to impoſe upon him [m]. I will not pretend, as ſome have done, to juſtify *Ruffinus*; but cannot help obſerving, that ſuch a Charge ought not to be admitted againſt him, upon the bare Authority of *Jerom*, or of thoſe, who have only copied what he wrote.

Jerom and *Ruffinus* had lived ſeveral Years in cloſe Friendſhip, and great Intimacy; but, falling out in the Year 393, their former Friendſhip was turned at once into an open and avowed Enmity. What gave Occaſion to this Breach I ſhall relate hereafter, and only obſerve here, that *Jerom* not only quarrelled with *Ruffinus*, but with all the Friends of *Ruffinus*; nay, and with thoſe too, who, profeſſing an equal

Jerom and Ruffinus quarrel.

[l] Paul. ep. 1. [m] Hier. ep. 16. & in Ruff. l. 3. c. 6, & 7.

Friendſhip for both, would not break with either, or any-ways interfere in the Quarrel. Among theſe was the celebrated *Roman* Matron *Melania*, ſo frequently ſpoken of, and ſo highly commended, by *Auſtin*, by *Paulinus*, and, above all, by *Jerom* himſelf, who hath filled his Letters with her Praiſes, propoſing her as a true Pattern of every Virtue becoming her Sex.

Melania had retired with *Ruffinus* to *Jeruſalem*, Twenty-ſeven Years before, and continued there practiſing, under his Direction, thoſe Works of Charity, which *Jerom* ſo often admireth, and extolleth. It could not therefore be expected, that ſhe ſhould diſcard *the Partner of her holy Life, and all her good Works*, as *Paulinus* ſtyleth him [n], the Minute the other was pleaſed to diſlike him, or, indeed, that ſhe ſhould take any Part at all in the Quarrel. And yet, becauſe ſhe prudently declined taking Part, but continued to ſhew the ſame Affection and Eſteem for *Ruffinus*, which ſhe had done before; *Jerom*, forgetful of the Regard that was due to a Matron of her Birth and Piety, and of the high Encomiums which he had himſelf beſtowed on her, began to enveigh with no leſs Bitterneſs againſt her, than againſt *Ruffinus* himſelf. In one of his Letters, ſtill extant [o], after finding Fault with one of *Ruffinus*'s Friends, thought to be *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, he addeth; "But after all, he is not ſo much "to blame as his Inſtructors *Ruffinus* and *Melania*, "who, with a great deal of Trouble and Pains, have "taught him to know nothing." *Ruffinus* telleth us, that *Jerom*, finding that *Melania*, who was a Matron of great Judgment and Penetration, did not approve of his Actions and Conduct, thereupon ſpitefully eraſed out of his Chronicle, what he had there wrote in her Praiſe [p]. But he did not, nor was it, perhaps, in his Power to make ſuch an Alteration in all the Copies;

Jerom quarrelleth with all the Friends of Ruffinus, *eſpecially with* Melania.

His Conduct towards her.

[n] Paul. ep. 9. [o] Hier. ep. 101. [p] Ex. Ruff. l. 2.

Copies; for what he is ſaid to have cancelled, is ſtill remaining in all the printed, as well as manuſcript Copies of that Work, which have reached our Times. *Melania* lived Eighteen Years after, ſteadily purſuing the ſame Courſe of Life, for which *Jerom* had once propoſed her as a Pattern to her whole Sex [q]. She died at *Jeruſalem* in the Year 411, and died poor, having ſpent an immenſe Eſtate in relieving the Needy and Indigent, not only of the Countries where ſhe lived, and through which ſhe paſſed, but thoſe too of the moſt diſtant Provinces of the Empire. For Perſons in Poverty and Diſtreſs, whether in *Perſia* or *Britain*, ſays the Author of her Life [r], were alike the Objects of her Charity, and felt alike the Effects of her Generoſity and Good-nature. She died, but with her did not die the Rancour and Spleen which *Jerom* had for ſo many Years harboured in his Breaſt againſt her. For, carrying his Reſentment even beyond the Grave, while the Poor were every-where bemoaning, with Tears, the Loſs of ſo generous a Benefactreſs, while the Writers were paying the deſerved Tribute of Praiſe to the Virtues of ſo pious a Matron, *Jerom*, inſtead of joining the reſt in the common Grief, ſtrove to dry up their Tears, to drown their Praiſes, by throwing out ſeveral peeviſh and ill-natured Reflections on the Memory of the Deceaſed. As the famous *Pelagius* had inſcribed a Book to her before he broached his Opinions, *Jerom*, in the Letter which he wrote to *Cteſiphon* againſt the *Pelagians*, could not forbear bringing her in, and obſerving on that Occaſion, with a malignant Quibble, that the very Name of *Melania* beſpoke (in the *Greek* Tongue), and ſufficiently declared, the *Blackneſs* of her Treachery and Perfidiouſneſs [s].

Such

[q] Vide Hier. ep. 99. [r] Pallad. hiſt. Lauſiac. in Bibl. Patr. c. 118. [s] Hier. ad Cteſ. l. 2.

Syricius *not to be condemned on the bare Authority of* Jerom.

Such was the Conduct of *Jerom* towards that illustrious Matron, in her Life-time, and after her Death. From this Conduct I leave the Reader to judge, whether the Authority of so prejudiced a Writer ought to have been of such Weight with *Baronius* as to make him exclude her, as well as *Syricius*, from the *Roman* Martyrology, or the Calendar of Saints. Should we grant *Ruffinus* to have really held the Errors, which *Jerom* charged him with, it must still be owned, that *Melania* acted, as became a Person of her Wisdom, Piety, and Experience, in suspending her Judgment, and not breaking with *Ruffinus*, until she was otherwise convinced, than by the Invectives of his Antagonist, equally levelled against herself, that he was no longer worthy of her Friendship and Regard. As for *Syricius*, *Jerom* rather commends than blameth him, even where he complaineth of his Kindness to *Ruffinus*. For he only says, that *Ruffinus* abused the Simplicity of *Syricius*, who judged of the Spirit of others from his own[t]; which was saying, in other Words, that he was a good Man, but mistaken in his Judgment, or not infallible: so that his only Crime, according to *Jerom*, was want of Infallibility. However, upon the Authority of that Father, *Baronius* not only condemns the Conduct of *Syricius*, but, rashly prying into the inscrutable Secrets of Providence, pretendeth his Days to have been shortened for the Countenance he gave to *Ruffinus*, and the Remissness he shewed in suppressing the Errors, with which he was charged. It is certain, that *Ruffinus* was well received, and entertained, in a very hospitable manner, by *Syricius*, during his Stay at *Rome*; and that, upon his leaving that City, he received from him Letters of Communion. Now, if *Syricius* did not know, or did not believe, that *Ruffinus* held those Errors, how unjust is it to blame him for the Kindness he shewed to a Man of *Ruffinus*'s Character! If he

[t] Hier. in Ruf. l. 3. c, 6, 7.

he did know, and yet gave him Letters of Communion, how will *Baronius* be able to clear *Syricius* from the Imputation of holding the ſame Errors (A)?

As for the Treatment *Paulinus* of *Nola* met with from *Syricius*, there was, no doubt, a Miſunderſtanding between them; but, as I am quite in the Dark as to the Cauſe of it, I will not take upon me to condemn the one rather than the other. Perhaps they were both to blame; perhaps they both meant well, and neither was to blame. However that be, the Miſunderſtanding between them was ſoon removed; for, during the remaining Part of *Syricius*'s Life, *Paulinus* went conſtantly to *Rome* once a Year, as he himſelf declareth in one of his Letters [u]. *Syricius*, it is true, did not take *Jerom* into his Protection, as his Predeceſſor had done, nor ſhew him the ſame Kindneſs; which is the Third Charge brought by *Baronius* againſt him, but of no more Weight than the other Two, that is, of none at all. *Jerom*, prompted by his Zeal, and cenſorious Temper, could not help inveighing, with great Bitterneſs, in all his Writings, againſt the Looſeneſs and Debauchery, which univerſally prevailed, in his Time, among the *Roman* Clergy, and the pious Frauds they made uſe of to extort Legacies and Preſents from old Men, from

The Miſunderſtanding between Syricius *and* Paulinus *no Charge againſt* Syricius.

[u] Paulin. ep. 16.

(A) A modern Writer (1), taking the Part of *Syricius* againſt *Baronius*, hath compoſed a whole Diſſertation, and not a ſhort one, to ſhew *how undeſervedly* Syricius *hath been caſhiered in this Review of the Church triumphant, while many others paſſed Muſter for great Saints, whoſe Virtues*, he might have ſaid, whoſe very Exiſtence, *may be juſtly diſputed*. I ſhall not enter into the tedious Detail of his Arguments and Reaſons, but only obſerve, that the Name of *Syricius* ought not to have been ſtruck out of the Calendar, while the Names of the *Arian* Pope *Liberius*, and the Antipope *Felix*, his Antagoniſt, were kept in; although, upon other Accounts, I think him myſelf very unworthy of the Name of a Saint.

(1) Florentinus, in vetus Martyrol. Hieronymi, p. 1001—1010.

from Widows, and from Orphans. *Syricius* might have been as much offended at the Vices of his libertine Clergy, as *Jerom* was, and even ſtudied to reform them; but, at the ſame time, be glad, without deſerving the leaſt Reproach on that ſcore, to get rid of ſo troubleſome a Cenſor, who thus expoſed their Irregularities to the Eyes, and them to the Contempt of the World (B).

Syricius was interred in the Cœmetery of *Priſcilla*, but his Body was tranſlated, about the Latter-end of the Eighth Century, to the Church of St. *Praxedes*[z], where his Remains (for *Baronius* will not allow us to call them Reliques) ſtill lie unregarded.

ARCADIUS, **ANASTASIUS,** HONORIUS.

Thirty-eighth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Chriſt 398.

SYRICIUS was ſucceeded by *Anaſtaſius*[a], after a Vacancy of Twenty Days, according to ſome; and, according to others, of near Two Months. He was no ſooner choſen, than he wrote a kind and obliging

Anaſtaſius *writeth to* Paulinus.

[z] Vid. Boll. prop. p. 59. [a] Theod. l. 5. c. 24. Soz. l. 7. c. 34. Aug. de civ. Dei.

(B) The Feſtival of *Syricius* was never kept, it ſeemeth, by public Authority; but is marked in ſome antient Martyrologies, on the 22d of *February*, and in others on the 26th of *November*. The laſt was more probably the Day of his Death, ſince he is ſaid, both by *Proſper* and *Iſidore*, to have governed Fourteen Years, to complete which one Month only will be wanting, if we place his Death on that Day; and ſeveral, if with *Baronius* we ſuppoſe him to have died on the 22d of *February* (2); for, as to the Year of his Death, there is no Diſagreement among Authors. *Baronius* mentioneth an antient Picture, Part whereof, ſaith he, is ſtill to be ſeen in the Title of Pope *Syricius* (3). But that Picture is no more to be ſeen, and he explaineth himſelf no farther.

(2) Vid. Boll. 22 Feb. p. 282. (3) Bar. ad ann. 395. n. 6.

obliging Letter to *Paulinus*, then at *Nola* in *Campania*, and another in his Commendation to the Biſhops of that Province [b]. This he is ſuppoſed to have done, in order to efface the bad Impreſſion, which the Treatment *Paulinus* had met with in the Time of *Syricius*, might have given him againſt that See, and the *Roman* Clergy.

What occaſioned the Quarrel between Jerom *and* Ruffinus.

It was in the Time of *Anaſtaſius*, and ſoon after his Election, that the famous Diſpute aroſe between *Jerom* and *Ruffinus*, which was afterwards carried on with a Warmth on both Sides quite unbecoming Men of their Profeſſion. Of this Quarrel, and the Part *Anaſtaſius* acted on that Occaſion, the Writers of thoſe Times give us the following Account. *Ruffinus*, a Preſbyter of *Aquileia*, and a great Admirer of *Origen*, having accompanied *Melania*, whom he had attended Twenty-five Years at *Jeruſalem*, on her Return to *Rome* in the Time of *Syricius*, was received there with extraordinary Marks of Eſteem by the *Roman* Clergy, and *Syricius* himſelf, as I have obſerved elſewhere [c]. Encouraged by the Reception he met with, he continued a whole Year at *Rome*; and during that Time publiſhed, but without putting his Name to it, a *Latin* Tranſlation of *Origen*'s *Periarchon*, or *Treatiſe of Principles*, having firſt removed the Prejudice which ſome might entertain againſt that Writer, by the Tranſlation of an Apology, which the Martyr *Pamphylus* had compoſed in his Vindication, while he was in Priſon. To this Apology he added a Piece of his own, ſhewing that moſt of the Errors aſcribed to *Origen* had been maliciouſly inſerted into his Works by his Enemies after his Death [d]. In the Preface to the *Periarchon* itſelf he alſo declared, that, in Imitation of a learned Brother, meaning *Jerom*, who had tranſlated above Seventy of *Origen*'s Books, he had either corrected or ſuppreſſed

Ruffinus tranſlates Origen's Periarchon.

[b] Paul ep. 16. [c] Page 366. [d] Hier. Apol. l. 2. ep. 75. & dial. adverſ. Pelag.

suppressed such Errors as had appeared to him repugnant to the Articles of the Catholic Faith [e]. The Work, thus recommended, was received with uncommon Applause at *Rome*, and the Sentiments of *Origen* greedily embraced, and warmly maintained by great Numbers of the Clergy as well as the Laity, to whom *Origen* had until then been, it seemeth, utterly unknown. This happened in the Time of *Syricius*, who, either not suspecting *Ruffinus*, as he had not put his Name to the Translation, or perhaps not judging him worthy of Censure for barely relateing the Sentiments of another, or supposing that, agreeably to his Preface, he had suppressed whatever was wrong in the original Work, gave him Letters of Communion at his Departure from *Rome*. For he had no sooner published his Translation than he left that City, and returned to *Aquileia*. *Syricius* died soon after, and *Anastasius* was no sooner chosen in his room, than the famous *Roman* Matron *Marcella*, offended at the new Doctrines that began to prevail in *Rome*, applied to him, pressing him to put a Stop to the growing Evil, and at the same time accusing *Ruffinus* as the Author of the Translation, to which alone it was owing [f]. To make good this Charge, she produced some Copies corrected with *Ruffinus*'s own Hand; and several Persons appeared, who, having by her Means been reclaimed from the Errors of *Origen*, owned they had been led into them by the Disciples of *Ruffinus* [g]. This *Jerom* cannot relate without launching into the Praises of his Heroine *Marcella*, crying up her Zeal, extolling her Courage and Resolution, in thus making head against so numerous a Band, meaning the *Origenists* in *Rome*, while the Clergy declined that Trouble, or rather promoted the Doctrines they ought to have opposed. But elsewhere he will not allow Women, under any Pretence whatsoever, to concern themselves in religious Controversies. *To meddle in Disputes concerning Faith*

Many at Rome *embrace the Errors of* Origen.

Errors left in the Work, notwithstanding the Corrections made by the Translator.

[e] Id. ap. 1. adverſ. Ruff. [f] Id. ib. [g] Id. ib.

Faith or Religion, is not at all the Province (ſaith he, with the Words of St. *Paul*) *of ſilly Women, laden with Sins, led away with divers Luſts, ever learning, and never able to come to the Knowlege of the Truth* [h]. But he ſpeaketh here of *Melania*, who was no leſs attached to *Ruffinus* than *Marcella* was to him.

Jerom's Charge againſt Ruffinus.

In the *Periarchon* were contained, without all doubt, many unſound and unwarrantable Notions, and *Ruffinus* corrected thoſe only that related to the Trinity. *He corrected*, ſaith *Jerom*, *what* Origen *had impiouſly written concerning the Trinity, being well appriſed it would have given great Offence at* Rome. *But as to his other Errors, thoſe eſpecially concerning the Fall of the Angels, and the firſt Man, the Reſurrection, the World or Worlds of* Epicurus, *the Reſtoration of all Things*, &c. *he either left them, as he found them in the Original, or confirmed them with Reaſons borrowed from the Comment of* Didymus, *an avowed Defender of* Origen. *Thus he declared himſelf a Catholic with reſpect to the Trinity, that in other Points the Reader might not be aware of him as an Heretic* [i].

Ruffinus's Anſwer.

In Anſwer to this Charge, *Ruffinus* declared, that it was never his Intention to correct all the Errors that were aſcribed to *Origen*; that the Declaration he had made, in his Preface to the *Periarchon*, ought to be reſtrained to thoſe Errors only that related to the Trinity; and that it was very uncharitable to judge of his Faith, from the Faith of the Author he tranſlated, and not from his own Words. He then declareth his Sentiments touching ſome particular Points, in which *Origen* was thought to differ from the Church; adding, that where *Origen* differed from the Catholic Church, he differed from *Origen*.

Jerom condemns Origen, and inveighs againſt Ruffinus.

Anaſtaſius, notwithſtanding the Solicitations of *Marcella*, declined either proceeding againſt *Ruffinus*, or cenſuring his Tranſlation, until Two Years after, when

[h] Id. & Cteſiphont. adverſ. Pelag. Tim. 2. c. 3. p. 6, 7.
[i] Id. apol. 1. adverſ. Ruff.

when *Jerom*, in a new Version which he published of the same Work, undertook to prove, that several Opinions of *Origen* were truly heretical, and as such ought to be condemned by the Church. As to *Ruffinus*, he inveighed bitterly against him, as if he had translated that Work with no other View but to propagate the Errors it contained. Thus began the famous Quarrel between these Two Writers, which occasioned no small Disturbance in the Church, some siding with *Jerom* against *Ruffinus*, and others with *Ruffinus* against *Jerom*. Among the former, the most sanguine were *Theophylus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, *Epiphanius* Bishop of *Constantia* in the Island of *Cyprus*, and *Anastasius* Bishop of *Rome*. *Theophylus* not only condemned in a Council, which he summoned for that Purpose, the Errors of *Origen*, but *Origen* himself, declaring him an Heretic, and forbidding all under his Jurisdiction to read, or even keep his Works by them; which is the first Instance we have of such Prohibitions. His Example was followed by *Epiphanius*, *Anastasius*, *Venerius* Bishop of *Milan*, *Chromatius* Bishop of *Aquileia*, and several others. But some, and among the rest *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and *Chrysostom* then Bishop of *Constantinople*, disapproving the rash Conduct of their Collegues, could by no means be induced to confirm the Sentence they had pronounced; which *Epiphanius* resented to such a Degree, that he immediately separated himself from their Communion. *Sozomen* adds, that he even refused to pray for young *Theodosius*, while he was dangerously ill, because his Mother *Eudoxia* would not banish from *Constantinople* some Monks who had warmly espoused the Cause of *Origen*[k]. *Ruffinus* ranketh *Epiphanius* among those Plagiaries, who, borrowing from *Origen* all they said or wrote, cried down his Works, in order to deter others from reading them, and consequently from discovering

Origen condemned by Anastasius, and several other Bishops

[k] Soz. l. 8. c. 15.

diſcovering that what was admired in them was not their own [l].

Origen being thus condemned as an Heretic, near 150 Years after his Death, *Anaſtaſius*, at the Inſtigation of *Marcella*, *Pammachius*, *Oceanus*, and ſome other of *Jerom*'s Friends in *Rome*, wrote to *Ruffinus*, complaining of his Tranſlation, and ſummoning him to appear, and give an Account of his Faith. In Anſwer to this Letter, *Ruffinus* ſent him a Confeſſion of Faith intirely agreeable to that of the Catholic Church, adding, that he held no other; that his Faith had been ſufficiently tried in the Perſecution of *Valens*; and that, as to the Tranſlation of *Origen*'s Work, he had there neither approved nor diſapproved, but barely related, the Sentiments of that Writer. He modeſtly declined complying with the Summons calling him to *Rome*; and concluded with declaring, that the Faith of the *Roman* Church and his were one and the ſame [m] (A). *Ruffinus is ſummoned to Rome.*

But

[l] Hier. in Ruff. l. 2. c. 6. l. 3. c. 7. & Ruff. ad Orig. [m] Hier. in Ruff. c. 6, 7. ep. 16, 78.

(A) The chief Errors of *Origen* were concerning the Trinity, the Reſurrection of the Body, the Eternity of Hell-Torments, and the Origin of Souls. If his Works were not interpolated by the Heretics, as *Ruffinus* pretended they were, it is no eaſy Matter to determine what was his real Opinion with reſpect to the Trinity; for in ſome Paſſages he ſeemeth to acknowlege an Equality, and in others to eſtabliſh an Inequality, between the Father and the Son. As to the Reſurrection, he was accuſed of not believing that the Body, at leaſt the ſame Body, was to riſe from the Dead. He denied the Eternity of Hell-Torments, and held that even the Devils would repent in the End, and be ſaved. He maintained the Souls to have been created before the World; to have been confined to the Bodies, which they animated, as ſo many Priſons, to expiate there the Sins which they had committed; to be in perpetual Motion paſſing from one Body to another, and at laſt to become Angels. With the Three laſt Errors chiefly *Ruffinus* was charged by St. *Jerom*; and it was to clear himſelf from ſuch an Imputation, that, in his Anſwer to *Anaſtaſius* ſummoning him to *Rome*, he declared his Belief with reſpect to thoſe Articles, ſtyling his Anſwer on that account an *Apology*.

As

Anastasius *separates himself from his Communion.*

But this Confession, however orthodox, did not satisfy *Anastasius*, or rather *Jerom* and his Friends in *Rome*. They continued, saith *Ruffinus*, the Persecution which they had so successfully begun, and with their malicious Suggestions prevailed in the End on *Anastasius* to comply with their unjust Demands[m]; that is, I suppose, to separate himself from his Communion: for *Anastasius*, in his Answer to a Letter which *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem* had wrote in favour of *Ruffinus*, acquainteth that Prelate, that

[m] Idem ibid.

As to the Trinity, those whom they called *Origenists*, were allowed, even by their Enemies, to be quite orthodox in their Belief of that Mystery. Touching the Resurrection, *Ruffinus* declared and explained his Faith in such clear Terms as ought to have left no room even for St. *Jerom* to arraign him on that Head. He expressed himself in a manner no less orthodox with respect to the Eternity of the Pains of Hell. But as to the Origin of Souls, he owneth himself to be quite at a Loss what to think, and what to determine on that Subject, since no particular Opinion had been yet settled by the Church, and the Ecclesiastical Writers disagreed in that Point among themselves; some believing, with *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*, the Souls to have been formed with the Bodies, and others maintaining, with *Origen*, that they were all created before the World: as to himself, he declared that he held nothing for certain but what he was taught by the Church, *viz.* that the Souls as well as the Bodies proceeded from God (1). This *Jerom* called a false, artful, and imposing Confession, as if *Ruffinus* did not believe what he professed in the most solemn Manner to believe; and *Anastasius*, judging of his Faith not from his own Words, but from those of *Jerom*, separated himself from his Communion.

I cannot help observing here, that *Jerom*, whom nothing now will satisfy but the Condemnation of *Origen*, used a few Years before to inveigh with the same Gall and Bitterness against the Enemies of that Writer as he doth now against his Friends, condemning with as much Acrimony those who accused him, as he now condemns those who excuse him. *Origen* had been condemned in his Life-time by *Demetrius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and by several other Bishops: and *Jerom*, after telling us, in speaking of the Judgment that was given against him, that he had wrote more Books than others had time to read; and that in the Number of his Volumes he had surpassed *Varro*, and the other most

(1) Ruff. ad Anast. p. 202.

that he had cut him off from his Communion, and left him to be judged by God and his own Conſcience. *As to* Origen, ſaith he in the ſame Letter, *I knew not before who he was, nor what he had wrote.* Ruffinus *hath tranſlated him into our Language; and, in ſo doing, what elſe could he have in view but to infect this Church with his pernicious Doctrines? He hath expreſſed his own Sentiments in tranſlating thoſe of his Author, and is therefore no leſs guilty than* Origen *himſelf, whom we have all condemned*[n] (B).

In

[n] Concil. t. 2. p. 1194.

moſt eloquent Writers both *Greek* and *Latin*; addeth, *But what Reward did he receive for ſo much Toil and Labour? He was condemned by the Biſhop* Demetrius; *and, if we except the Biſhops of* Palæſtine, Arabia, Phœnicia, *and* Achaia, *he was condemned by all the reſt. Even* Rome *aſſembled her Senate againſt him, not becauſe he taught any new Doctrines, or held any heretical Opinions, which thoſe who ſnarl at him, like ſo many mad Dogs, would fain make us believe; but becauſe they could not bear the bright Rays of his Eloquence and Knowlege, and were forced to be dumb when he ſpoke.* This Paſſage is quoted by *Ruffinus*, and *Jerom* himſelf owneth it to have been copied from his Letter to *Paula* (2).

By the Senate that *Rome* aſſembled againſt *Origen*, *Jerom* meant, no doubt, the Biſhop and Clergy of that City; and that he made no Account of their Judgment, ſufficiently appeareth from the contemptuous and ironical Manner he ſpeaketh of it. However, that Father is brought in by *Baronius* as an Evidence for *Infallibility*, on account of the Regard which he afterwards paid to the Judgment of *Anaſtaſius*, ſtyling it a *deciſive Sentence*. But *Jerom* had then changed his Opinion; and *Anaſtaſius* only condemned what he had condemned before; ſo that from the great Regard which *Jerom* ſhewed on that Occaſion for the Judgement of *Anaſtaſius*, *Baronius* can at moſt conclude, that he thought the Popes infallible when they agreed with him; for that he thought them fallible when they diſagreed with him, is manifeſt from his not acquieſcing to the Judgment of another Pope condemning *Origen*, when he himſelf had not yet condemned him.

(B) The ſame Charge lieth againſt *Jerom*; nay, he was the more guilty of the Two. For he had not only tranſlated many of *Origen*'s Works, containing Errors no leſs repugnant to the Catholic Truths than any in the *Periarchon*, but had beſides filled his Comments on the Scripture, eſpecially on the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*,

(2) Hier. vir. illuſtr. c. 54. Ruff. l. 2. p. 225.

In the same Letter *Anastasius* mentioneth with great Joy a Decree of the Emperors, that is, of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*, forbidding the Works of *Origen*, and imposing severe Penalties on such as should for the future read or peruse them (C).

The Condemnation of Origen owing chiefly to the Bishop of Alexandria.

Such is the Account the cotemporary Writers, and *Jerom* himself, give us of the Condemnation of *Origen*, and his Interpreter *Ruffinus*, very different from

Ephesians, with the worst of *Origen*'s Errors, *viz.* with those relating to the Resurrection of the Body, to the Pre-existence of the Soul, and to the Duration of Hell-Torments, as is manifest from the many Passages quoted by *Ruffinus* out of the Comments of that Father. *Jerom* found great Fault with *Ruffinus*, for not confuting the Errors which he translated; concluding from thence that he held the same Doctrines: and yet he was himself so far from confuting in his Comments any of *Origen*'s erroneous Opinions, that on the contrary he often delivered them in such manner as made many, and St. *Austin* among the rest, believe them to be his own (1) Nay, in one Place he seemeth to own, that he held some of *Origen*'s Errors (2): but endeth what he there writeth of him thus; *If you believe me, I never was an* Origenist; *but if you absolutely insist upon my having been one, I now tell you, that I am so no more; and it is to convince you of this, that I am become the Accuser of* Origen.

(C) *Ruffinus* pretended this Letter to be suppositious, and to have been forged by St. *Jerom*, alleging, that he could not believe the Bishop of *Rome* capable of such a crying Piece of Injustice as to condemn an innocent Man, and condemn him in his Absence. He added, that if *Anastasius* had ever wrote such a Letter to *John* of *Jerusalem*, *John*, with whom he lived in great Intimacy, would have acquainted him with it, which he had not done. In Answer to this Charge, *Jerom* referreth him to the Archives of the *Roman* Church (3); and to *Jerom* I refer the Jesuit *Halloix*, supposing the Letter to have been feigned, although not by St. *Jerom*, on account of the following Words, that seem to wound the pretended Supremacy. *I have intirely separated myself from him*, meaning *Ruffinus*; *I will not even know where he is, or what he is doing: let him try, if he pleaseth, to be absolved elsewhere.* So that *Anastasius* thought he might be absolved elsewhere, although condemned at *Rome*. This *Halloix*, more jealous of the Papal Supremacy than the Pope himself, will not allow, and therefore pretends the Letter to be suppositious. But, since the Time of *Ruffinus*, none besides him ever questioned its Authenticity.

(1) Hier. ep. 89. (2) Hier. ep. 65. (3) Hier. in Ruff *l.* 3. c. 5, & 6.

from that which we read in *Baronius*, introducing his *High Pontiff Anaſtaſius* as acting the Firſt Part on that Occaſion; although *Jerom* telleth us, in expreſs Terms, that *Anaſtaſius* followed the Example of *Theophylus*; that he condemned in the Weſt, what had before been condemned in the Eaſt [n]; and that *Rome* and all *Italy* owed their Deliverance to the Letters of *Theophylus* [o]; meaning the circular Letter, which *Theophylus* wrote to all the Catholic Biſhops, acquainting them that he had condemned *Origen*, and prohibited his Books, and exhorting them to follow his Example [p]. It was by this Letter that *Anaſtaſius* was induced to condemn *Origen*: For what elſe could *Jerom* mean by ſaying, that *Rome* and *Italy* were, by the Letters of *Theophylus*, delivered from the Errors of *Origen*? *Baronius* could not but know, that the Letter of *Theophylus* was addreſſed to all the Catholic Biſhops, ſince it is ſtyled by *Theophylus* himſelf, in a Letter he wrote to *Epiphanius* [q], and by *Epiphanius*, in one of his Letters to *Jerom* [r], *A general Letter to all Catholics*; and yet the Annaliſt ſpeaketh of it as directed to *Anaſtaſius* alone, in order to impoſe by that means on his Readers, and perſuade them, *that the Biſhop of* Alexandria *ſubmitted the Sentence he had pronounced to the Judgment of* Anaſtaſius, *being well appriſed, that it could be of no Weight, unleſs confirmed by the firſt See.* Had he been well appriſed of this, I cannot think he would have pronounced ſuch a Sentence, as it is very certain he did, without the Authority, the Advice, or even the Knowlege, of the *firſt See*.

As to *Ruffinus*, *Anaſtaſius*, it is true, ſeparated himſelf from his Communion; but did not excommunicate him, that is, as the Word is now underſtood, did not cut him off from the Communion of the

The Biſhop of Aquileia *communicates with* Ruffinus, *though excommunicated by* Anaſtaſius.

[n] Hier. ep. 78. [o] Id. ep. 71. [p] Id. ep. 6, 69, 70. [q] Id. ep. 6. [r] Id. ep. 73.

the Catholic Church, as *Baronius* insinuateth. The Power of excommunicating him in this Sense was by the Canons vested in his own Bishop; and it is manifest from *Jerom*, that *Chromatius*, then Bishop of *Aquileia*, continued to communicate with him after *Anastasius* had renounced his Communion; nay, after *Chromatius* himself had condemned *Origen*, and the *Origenists* [f], that is, those who held the Errors of *Origen*. A plain Proof that the Bishop of *Aquileia* did not acquiesce to the Judgment of *Anastasius* in ranking *Ruffinus* among them. And truly the only Charge brought against him by *Anastasius*, in his Letter to *John* of *Jerusalem*, was his having translated *Origen* into the *Latin* Tongue, without pointing out his Errors, or offering any Arguments to confute them. Thence he was by *Jerom* induced to conclude, that *Ruffinus* held the same Errors. *What could* Ruffinus *propose*, saith he in his Letter, *by translating* Origen *into the* Roman *Language? Had he exposed the execrable Errors his Work containeth, and raised in his Readers that Indignation which the Author deserveth, I should rather have praised than blamed him. But he hath in his Mind consented to those Errors, and in translating the Sentiments of* Origen *expressed his own* [t]. This *Ruffinus* denied, declaring, with the Words of *Origen*, in his Preface to the *Periarchon* [u], that he embraced nothing as Truth, that any-ways differed from the received Doctrines of the Catholic Church: nay, he was so far from defending any of *Origen*'s Errors, which seemed to him repugnant to the Catholic Truths, that in the Apology he composed in Defence of that Writer, as well as in the Preface which he prefixed to his Translation, he undertook to prove that those Errors were not his, but had been maliciously inserted into his Works, either by his Enemies to eclipse his Reputation, or by Heretics,

Ruffinus unjustly condemned.

[f] Apol. l. 3. c. 1. [t] Concil. t. 2. p. 1194. [u] Præf. ad Periarch. p. 665.

retics, who had fathered upon him their own Doctrines, with a View of recommending them to the World by the Authority of ſo great and ſo venerable a Name [w]. He followed therein the Example of the moſt eminent Writers, and the greateſt Lights of the Church, namely, of the Martyr *Pamphylus* [x], of *Athanaſius* [y], *Baſil* [z], his Brother *Gregory* of *Nyſſa* [a], *Gregory Nazianzen* [b], and many others, who, out of the great Regard they had for a Man of *Origen*'s Piety and Learning, either aſcribed to others the Errors they found in his Works, or excuſed them, by putting on his Words the moſt charitable Conſtruction they could bear. *Jerom* himſelf had been formerly one of *Origen*'s greateſt Admirers, had tranſlated above Seventy of his Books, and thought he could not employ his Time better than in enriching the *Latin* Tongue with the Works of *the beſt Writer and firſt Doctor of the Church after the Apoſtles* [c], as he then ſtyled him. As *Ruffinus*, in his Tranſlation of the *Periarchon*, endeavoured to excuſe the Errors of *Origen*, ſo had *Jerom* done before him in tranſlating his other Works, chuſing rather to *veil and excuſe*, than *expoſe* the Faults of one whom in other reſpects he ſo much admired [d]. But this Admiration being afterwards changed into an open and avowed Enmity, *the firſt Doctor of the Church after the Apoſtles* became at once not only an *heterodox*, but an *impious Writer*; all who ſtood up in his Defence were arraigned of the ſame *peſtilential Doctrines*; and what was found amiſs in his Works was no longer *veiled* or *excuſed*, but ſet out in the worſt Light (D). But

Origen *excuſed by ſome of the Fathers, and once by* Jerom *himſelf.*

[w] Apol. pro Orig. apud Hier. t. 4. p. 194, 195. & præf. ad Periarch. [x] Phot. c. 118. [y] Athan. de Nicæn. decret. p. 277. Concil. t. 5. p. 652. Phot. c. 232. [z] Concil. t. 5. p. 653. [a] Phot. c. 232. & Nyſſ. in Cant. t. 1. p. 473. [b] Naz. or. 31. [c] Hier. de nom. Heb. p. 299. [d] Hier. ep. 65.

(D) Some of the Fathers would not allow even his Doctrine concerning

But what ſeemeth moſt of all ſurpriſing, and quite unaccountable, in the Conduct of that Father, is, that although he had with ſo much Noiſe procured *Origen* to be condemned as an Heretic, and his Books to be prohibited, particularly his *Periarchon*, or, as ſome will have it, the *Periarchon* alone, as containing moſt of his heretical Tenets; yet, in a private Letter to *Paulinus*, he referreth him to that very

concerning the Trinity to be heterodox. For ſome Paſſages being quoted out of his Works by the *Arians* to confirm their Opinions, *Baſil* and *Nazianzen* undertook to prove, from other Paſſages, that his Sentiments with reſpect to the Trinity were quite orthodox; and that the *Arians* had either out of Malice miſinterpreted, or out of Ignorance miſunderſtood, his Meaning, not being capable of fathoming the Depth of his Thoughts (1). It muſt be owned, that *Origen*, in ſeveral Places, ſpeaketh of the Trinity agreeably to the Sentiments of the Church, acknowlegeing *the Son to have been from the Beginning in the Father*; *to be the Image of the Father*; *to have been begotten by him from all Eternity*; *to be the Wiſdom of God*; *to be God, although not the Source and Origin of the Divinity, as the Father, whom on that Account he ſtyleth* Autotheos; *to be above all Creatures*; *to have the ſame Power as the Father, and to deſerve the ſame Honour and Worſhip*. But elſewhere he uſeth Expreſſions that can no-way bear an orthodox Senſe, *viz.* that *the* Verb *is an Hypoſtaſis different from the Father*; meaning, by the Word *Hypoſtaſis*, Nature and Subſtance; *that the Father and Son are One by Concord and Union*; *that the Son is not properly God, but called God, becauſe he is the Image of the Divinity*; *that the Verb and the Holy Ghoſt were made by the Father*; *that the Father is greater than the Son*; *that the Son is inferior to the Father, although far above all Creatures, as the Ray of the Sun is inferior to the Sun*; and laſtly, *that the Son is the Miniſter of the Father*. In theſe Paſſages is contained a very different Doctrine from that which is laid down in thoſe I have quoted above: and hence ſome of the Friends of *Origen*, and among the reſt *Ruffinus*, concluded the latter Paſſages to have been foiſted in by the *Arians*, denying the Divinity of the Verb; while others, allowing them to be *Origen*'s, undertook to explain them in a Catholic Senſe, in Oppoſition to the *Arians* confirming their Doctrine with the Authority of ſo eminent a Writer. But his Enemies, attending only to the Paſſages where he ſeemed to eſtabliſh an Inequality in the Trinity, not only condemned him as an Heretic, but all who ſtood up in his Defence, or attempted to interpret his Words in a Catholic Senſe.

(1) Socr. l. 4. c. 26.

very Piece for the Decision of some Questions of the greatest Importance [e]. But to return to *Anastasius*:

The same Year 401, in which *Origen* was condemned, the Churches of *Africa* being greatly distressed for want of Ecclesiastics, the Bishops of the Province of *Carthage*, assembling under *Aurelius* Bishop of that City, resolved to dispatch one of their Body into *Italy* to acquaint *Anastasius* and *Venerius* Bishop of *Milan*, with the Condition of the *African* Churches, and implore their Assistance [f]. Which of the Bishops was charged with this Legation, or what Success attended it, we are no-where told. But as *Paulinus*, who afterwards wrote the Life of St. *Ambrose*, and belonged to the Church of *Milan*, was at this Time sent into *Africa*, and continued there, some have not improbably conjectured, that *Venerius* at least assisted his Collegues in *Africa* with a Supply of as many Ecclesiastics as he could spare. *Baronius* supposeth *Anastasius* to have relieved those Churches with the like Supply; but this Supposition he buildeth upon the paternal Care which *Anastasius* had, as *universal Pastor*, of all the Catholic Churches [g], which is building on a false Foundation.

The Bishops of Africa apply to Anastasius and Venerius of Milan.

The same Year another Council was held at *Carthage*, consisting of all the Bishops of *Africa*; and *Aurelius*, who presided in this, as he had done in the former, opened it with reading a Letter from *Anastasius*, exhorting the Bishops of *Africa* no longer to dissemble the Cruelties of the *Donatists*, who continued to use with great Barbarity the Catholic Bishops and Clergy [h]. The Fathers of the Council returned *Anastasius* Thanks for his Advice; but, not thinking it quite agreeable to the true Spirit of Christianity, they declined complying with it. They knew that their Persecutors, had they complained of their

Anastasius advises the Bishops of Africa not to dissemble the Cruelties of the Donatists.

Who refuse to comply with his Advice.

[e] Hier. ep. 153. [f] Concil. t. 2. p. 1642. [g] Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 7. [h] Concil. t. 1. inter Concil. Afr. c. 33.

their Cruelties to the Civil Magistrate, would have been punished with Death, pursuant to a Law enacted against them, Three Years before, by the Emperor *Arcadius* and *Honorius* [i]. They therefore chose, notwithstanding the Advice of *Anastasius*, rather to suffer with Patience a most cruel Persecution, than redeem themselves from it at so dear a Rate [k]. In the same Council it was decreed, among other things, that such of the *Donatist* Clergy, as should return to the Church, might be admitted, if the Bishop, who received them, thought it expedient, to the same Rank, which they had enjoyed before their Conversion. As a Decree had been lately enacted by *Anastasius*, and the other *Italian* Bishops, excluding converted Heretics from the Catholic Clergy [l]; it was to acquaint them with the Motives which had prompted the Fathers, assembled at *Carthage*, to admit the *Donatists*, that *Aurelius* and his Collegues wrote to *Anastasius*; and not to beg of him a Dispensation in favour of the converted *Donatists*, as is ridiculously supposed by *Baronius* [m].

Anastasius *dies.*

This is all I find recorded of *Anastasius*, by the antient Writers. He died on the 27th of *April* 402, after having held the See of *Rome* Four Years, One Month, and Thirteen Days.

Is greatly commended by Jerom.

Jerom, with whom he sided against *Ruffinus*, and the other Friends of *Origen*, distinguisheth him with the Title of an *eminent Man*; and adds, *that* Rome *did not deserve to enjoy him long, lest the Head of the World should be cut off under such a Bishop*; *nay, he was snatched away*, saith he, *lest he should strive to ward off, with his Prayers, the Execution of the Sentence that was already pronounced*; *the Lord saying to* Jeremiah, *Pray not for this People for their Good: when they fast I will not hear their Cry*, &c [n]. *Jerom* speaketh there of the Calamities that befel *Rome* Seven Years after, when it

[i] Cod. Theod. l. 3. de episc. & cler. & Greg. l. 1. ep. 53. [k] Aug. ep. 127. [l] Concil. t. 2. p. 1642. [m] Bar. ad ann. 401. n. 14. [n] Hier. ep. 16. Jerem. c. 14. ver. 11, 12.

it was taken by the *Goths*, under *Alaric*. *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, not only an avowed Enemy to *Origen*, but a cruel Perſecutor of all who ſtood up in his Defence, extolleth *Anaſtaſius* for his paſtoral Care, and indefatigable Pains, in preſerving and maintaining the Purity of the Catholic Faith [o]; alluding, no doubt, to his acting in Concert with him, againſt *Origen*, and the pretended *Origeniſts*. Be that as it will, *Anaſtaſius* is now honoured as a Saint by the Church of *Rome*; and the Honours paid him are chiefly owing to the Commendations of *Jerom* and *Theophylus*, whoſe Party he ſo warmly eſpouſed. As to the Writings of *Anaſtaſius*, Mention is made, by *Jerom*, of ſeveral Letters written by him on different Occaſions; but that alone hath reached our Times, which he wrote to *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and ſome Fragments of another to one *Urſinus*, on the *Incarnation* (E).

Is honoured as a Saint.

Baronius obſerveth, at the Death of *Syricius* [p], that ſuch Popes as did not, through Sloth and Indolence, exert the due Zeal in extirpating the heterodox Opinions that ſprung up in the Church, that is, ſuch Popes as did not exterminate all, who differed in Opinion from them, have been quickly cut off, to make room for other more zealous Aſſerters of the Purity of the Faith. An ill-timed Obſervation! which

An ill timed Obſervation of Baronius.

[o] Juſtin. in ep. ad Menam. [p] Ad ann. 397. num. 21.

(E) The Two Decretals, that have been tranſmitted to us under his Name, are evidently ſuppoſititious, the one being dated Fourteen Years before his Election, and the other Fourteen Years after his Death. One of theſe pretended Decretals is addreſſed to the *German* and *Burgundian* Biſhops, although nothing is more certain, than that the *Burgundians* were not converted to the Chriſtian Religion until many Years after his Death, until the Year 436, if *Socrates* is to be credited (1). They are both made up of ſeveral Paſſages taken from the Letters of *Innocent*, *Leo*, *Gregory*, and others; and were, in all Likelihood, forged, as many others have been, by *Iſidorus Mercator*.

(1) Socr. l. 7. c. 30.

which I might retort here, were I inclined to indulge such a Humour, since the *indolent Syricius* enjoyed his Dignity Thirteen Years (and not very many have enjoyed it longer), and the *very zealous Anastasius* only Four.

ARCADIUS, HONORIUS,

INNOCENT,

THEODOSIUS *the younger.*

Thirty-ninth BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 402.

The Election of Innocent,

ON the Demise of *Anastasius*, *Innocent* was immediately, and with one Consent, chosen by the Clergy, and the People [a]. He was, according to *Anastasius* [b], a Native of *Albano*, and the Son of another *Innocent*; but, according to *Jerom*, both the Son and Successor of *Anastasius* [c]. *Theodoret* styleth him a Man of great Address, and a lively Genius [d]; *Prosper*, a worthy Successor of St. *Peter* [e]; and *Austin* distinguisheth him, after his Death, with the Title of the *Blessed Innocent* [f]. *Orosius* says, that God withdrew that holy Bishop from *Rome*, when the City was taken, as he did *Lot* from *Sodom* [g]; and *Jerom*, in writing to *Demetrius*, exhorteth her to adhere steadily to the Faith of *Innocent* [h]. *Austin*, in the Letter he wrote to him in the Name of the Council of *Milevum*, ascribeth his Election to a particular Providence; and adds, that the Fathers of the Council thought it a Duty incumbent upon them to suggest to him what might be done for the Good of the Church, since they could not think him capable of hearing any thing of that Nature with Contempt or Indifference [i].

commended by the Antients.

Innocent

[a] Collect. Rem. ab Holsten. p. 45. [b] Anast. c. 41. [c] Hier. ep. 8. [d] Theod. l. 5. c. 35. [e] Prosp. in Col. c. 10. [f] Pec. orig. c. 9. [g] Oros. l. 7. c. 39. [h] Hier. ubi supra. [i] Aug. ep. 92.

Innocent was no ſooner choſen and ordained, than he wrote to *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, acquainting him with his Election, and charging him, as his Three immediate Predeceſſors had done, with the Care of the Churches of *Eaſt Illyricum*[k]. In the End of the following Year 403, the Emperor *Honorius* viſited the City of *Rome*; and, during his Stay there, *Innocent* went frequently to wait on him, in order to obtain, in Behalf of ſome Biſhops, and other Eccleſiaſtics, an Exemption from executing certain Civil Offices hereditary in their Families. He ſucceeded in his Suit, but it coſt him a great deal of Trouble and Uneaſineſs[l]. *Victricius*, Biſhop of *Rouen*, who happened to be then at *Rome*, having applied to him for Information, with reſpect to the Practice and Diſcipline of the *Roman* Church, *Innocent*, to gratify him, and *that he might not ſeem to approve, by his Silence, the Abuſes that prevailed in ſome Churches*, ſent him a *Book of Rules*, as he ſtyled it, containing ſeveral Regulations, which had been originally eſtabliſhed, ſaith he, by the Authority of the Apoſtles and Fathers, but were now, in many Places, either quite unknown, or utterly neglected. He therefore intreateth *Victricius* to communicate them to the neighbouring Churches and Biſhops, that they might be acquainted with the Diſcipline of the *Roman* Church, and conform to it in inſtructing the new-converted Chriſtians[m].

He writes to Anyſius *of* Theſſalonica.

Innocent's *Letter to* Victricius.

This *Book of Rules* contains Thirteen Regulations relating to different Points of Diſcipline, whereof the Firſt forbiddeth, and declareth uncanonical, the Ordination of Biſhops without the Knowlege and Approbation of their Metropolitans. The Second excludeth from the Clerical Order ſuch as have ſerved, or ſhall continue to ſerve, in War after Baptiſm. The Third ordereth all Differences and Diſputes, ariſing

The Articles it contains.

[k] Coll. Rom. p. 46, 47. [l] Conc. t. 2. p. 1252. [m] Ibid. p. 1249.

ariſing among the Eccleſiaſtics to be decided by the Biſhops of the Provinces, *ſaving the Rights of the* Roman *Church* (A); and commands thoſe to be depoſed who ſhall recur to other Tribunals, except in Cauſes of the greateſt Importance, when, after the Biſhops have given Sentence, Recourſe may be had to the Apoſtolical See, purſuant to the Order of the Council; meaning, no doubt, the Council of *Sardica*[n]. The Three next relate to thoſe who ſhall have married a Widow, a Woman that hath been divorced, or a ſecond Wife, either before or after Baptiſm; and they are all alike declared incapable of being ever admitted among the Clergy. The Seventh forbiddeth Biſhops to ordain Clerks of another Church, without the Permiſſion of their own Biſhops, or to admit thoſe to ſerve one Church, who have been depoſed in another. The Eighth allows the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*, who return to the Church, to be readmitted by the bare Impoſition of Hands; but ſubjects thoſe to a long Penance, who had quitted the Church to be rebaptized by them. The Ninth relateth to the Celibacy of the Prieſts and Deacons, who are debarred by it from all Commerce with their Wives, after Ordination. The inferior Clergy were allowed to marry; but *Innocent*, by the Tenth Article of the preſent Letter, excepts thoſe who, before they were admitted among the Clergy, had lived in Monaſteries, and profeſſed Continence there; it being fit, ſaith he, they ſhould obſerve in a higher Rank what they had obſerved when only Monks. In the ſame Article he obſerves, that thoſe, who had loſt their Virginity before Marriage, did not receive the Bleſſing of the Church when they afterwards married; and that it was the antient Practice of the Church, that ſuch as had loſt it before Baptiſm, ſhould promiſe, before they were admitted to

[n] See above, p. 160, 161.

(A) In ſome Editions this Clauſe is wanting.

to the Clerical Order, never to marry. The Eleventh forbids thoſe to be ordained, who were not exempted from all Civil Offices and Employments, ſuch Offices diverting them from the Functions of the Prieſthood, and ſometimes obliging them to exhibit Shews and public Sports, of which the Devil was, without all Doubt, the Author and Promoter. The Twelfth forbideth Women, who have married a Second Huſband, their Firſt being ſtill alive, to be admitted to Repentance, or allowed to do Penance until one of the Two dieth. The ſame Diſcipline is to be obſerved, according to this Article, with reſpect to the Virgins, who, after conſecrating their Virginity to *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſhall, either by a public Marriage, or by private Fornication, violate the Faith they had pledged to their immortal Spouſe.

Innocent thinks the Marriage of a Woman with another Man valid, while her Huſband is ſtill alive.

Baronius [o], to anſwer the Objections which ſome *Innovators*, hs he is pleaſed to ſtyle them, have offered againſt the unchriſtian Severity of this Article, telleth us, that the Repentance of ſuch a Virgin can by no means be ſincere, ſo long as ſhe continueth with the Man ſhe married; which is quite foreign to the Purpoſe, ſince *Innocent* excludeth her from Repentance, not only ſo long as ſhe liveth with him, but ſo long as he liveth. *Innocent* knew what *Baronius* ſeemeth not to have known; *viz.* that the Marriage of Virgins, however ſolemnly conſecrated, held good, even according to the Practice of the *Roman* Church [p]; and, conſequently, that they could not abandon their Huſbands; and hence he would not admit them to Repentance, or the Participation of the Sacred Myſteries, until the Death of their Huſbands; which was keeping them, as it were, in a State of Excommunication, without any poſſible Means of redeeming themſelves from it. And it is this uncharitable Severity, which ſome Divines of the

The unchriſtian Severity of one of thoſe Articles ill excuſed by Baronius.

o Bar. ad ann. 404. num. 130.

p See Natal. Alex. hiſt. eccleſ. t. 10. p. 14.

the *Reformed Churches* have deſervedly blamed. *Baronius* ſtigmatizeth ſuch Marriages with the Name of *Adultery*; but he confounds the Time of *Innocent* with his own; for, in his Time, the Vow of Chaſtity was declared a true Marriage, and, conſequently, every ſubſequent Marriage void and null; but, in *Innocent*'s Time, the Marriage of a ſacred Virgin was held valid, although commonly deemed ſinful. Whether it be ſinful or no, or whether a Vow of that kind can be lawfully made, I ſhall not take upon me to determine here; but I am very confident, that of moſt Perſons, who debar themſelves by a ſolemn Vow from ever marrying, we may ſay, with the Fathers of the Eighth Council of *Toledo*, that *they had better break a Vow, which they had raſhly made, than fill up, by obſerving it, the Meaſure of their Sins.*

But to return to the Letter: The Thirteenth and laſt Article will have thoſe Virgins to do Penance for ſome time, who ſhall marry after having promiſed to live Virgins, although they had not yet received the Sacred Veil [q]. This Letter hath been inſerted by *Dionyſius Exiguus*, in his Code of the *Roman* Church, and is quoted by the Second Council of *Tours*, held in 567 [r], and by ſeveral other Councils [s] (A).

In

[q] Conc. t. 2. p. 1259—1252. [r] Concil. t. 5. p. 858. & 866. [s] See Blond. Decr. p. 551.

(A) And yet ſome have been induced by the Date it beareth, to queſtion its Authenticity. For it is dated the 15th of *February* 404. Now, it is manifeſt, ſay they, from the Letter itſelf, that *Victricius* was at *Rome* while the Emperor *Honorius* was there; and it is no leſs certain, that *Honorius* did not arrive at *Rome* until the Month of *December* 403. If therefore *Victricius* was at *Rome* in *December* 403, it is not at all probable, that *Innocent* ſhould have wrote to him on the 15th of *January* 404. To ſolve this Difficulty, ſome ſuppoſe *Victricius* to have applied to *Innocent*, while he was ſtill at *Rome*: and *Innocent*, inſtead of informing him, as he might, by Word of Mouth, to have given him in Writing the deſired Inſtructions, that, having thus more Weight, they might the more readily be complied with by other Biſhops. But it is manifeſt, from *Innocent*'s Words, that his Letter

In the Year 404, *Auſtin* wrote to *Innocent*, in the Name of the Biſhops aſſembled in Council at *Carthage*, intreating him to apply to *Honorius* for new Laws againſt the *Donatiſts*; whoſe Cruelties towards the Orthodox, if not magnified by *Auſtin*[u], are ſcarce to be matched in Hiſtory. The Emperor hearkened to *Innocent*'s Remonſtrances, and ſevere Laws being iſſued againſt them, they began by that means to be convinced of their Errors, and to return daily in great Numbers to the Unity of the Church. This is what we read in one of *Auſtin*'s Letters[w]; for the *Donatiſts*, as he would make us believe, finding themſelves perſecuted, began to inquire, which they had never done before, into the Grounds of the Religion, for which they ſuffered. This Inquiry had the deſired Effect; their Eyes were opened;

Letter of the Council of Carthage *to* Innocent.

[u] Aug. ep. 50. [w] Idem ibid.

ter was an Anſwer to one from *Victricius*; and we cannot well ſuppoſe *Victricius*, who was at *Rome* in *December*, to have returned to *Rouen*, to have wrote from thence to *Innocent*, and *Innocent* to have returned him ſo full an Anſwer by the 15th of the following *January*. We may conclude the Year to have been, by ſome Miſtake, altered, and 404, inſerted in the Date inſtead of 405, ſince the Letter could not be written earlier, as I have juſt obſerved, than the Month of *January* (if *January* was the true Month) of the latter Year; and we have no Reaſon to think it was written later. The Miſtake as to the Year might have been occaſioned by the Tranſcriber's omitting P. C. *Poſt Conſulatum Honorii*, and thereby confounding the Year of the Emperor's Sixth Conſulſhip 404, with the Year after it 405 —Such Omiſſions frequently occur, and have led Writers, not aware of them, into great Miſtakes, in point of Chronology, or made them ſuſpect, nay, and condemn, as ſpurious, the moſt authentic Pieces of Hiſtory. This Letter, in ſome Editions, beareth no Date; and F. *Labbé* aſſureth us, that he hath ſeen a manuſcript Copy of it, in which the Date was wanting. Some therefore ſuppoſe the Date to have been afterwards added, nay, and the whole Concluſion of the Letter. For *Innocent* cloſeth it by ſaying, that the Obſervance of the Rules it containeth will baniſh all Ambition among the Biſhops, compoſe all Differences, prevent all Schiſms, and leave no room for the Devil to inſult the Flock of Chriſt. A Concluſion taken probably from ſome other Piece, and not at all adapted or applicable, with Truth, to this.

ed; they discovered the Errors of their Sect; and, being sensible of their Folly in foregoing any temporal Advantage, or exposing themselves to the least Inconvenience, for the sake of such a Religion, they sincerely abjured it, and zealously embraced the Catholic Faith. An ingenious Turn, I must own, to excuse, nay, and to authorize and sanctify, the greatest Barbarities! But daily Experience teacheth us, that Persecution hath a contrary Effect, and that the more Men are persecuted, the more obstinately they adhere to the Opinions, however absurd, for which they suffer; witness the great Number of Martyrs which almost every Church, as well as the Catholic, can boast of. And, where it hath not that Effect, the most it can do is to make Men become Hypocrites, and profess a Religion they do not believe, but scarce ever changes their Hearts, or bringeth any to a sincere and efficacious Assent to a Faith which is thus violently forced on their Minds.

Innocent writes to the Bishops of Spain.

About the same time, or not long after, *Innocent* wrote to the Bishops of *Spain*; and the chief Articles of his Letter were: 1. That they ought to cut off from their Communion such of their Brethren as refused to communicate with *Symphosius*, *Dictinius*, and other Bishops, who, having renounced the Errors of *Priscillian*, had been re-admitted to the Communion of the Church by the Council held at *Toledo*, in the Year 400[x]. 2. That those Bishops should be deposed who had been ordained without the Knowlege or Consent of their Metropolitan. 3. That such as presumed to ordain against the Canons should be likewise deposed, and all who had been thus ordained by them.

Chrysostom *Bishop of* Constantinople *recurs to* Innocent.

Chrysostom, the celebrated Bishop of *Constantinople*, having been unjustly deposed in 403, and driven from his See by *Theophylus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and the Council *ad Quercum*, or at *the Oak*, near *Chalcedon*, had, upon his Return to *Constantinople*, insisted upon

[x] See above, p. 329.

upon a Council being ſummoned, to make his Innocence the more plainly appear to the World. This *Theophylus*, and the Biſhops of his Party, not only ſtrenuouſly oppoſed, but, by the great Intereſt they had at Court, prevailed upon the Emperor *Arcadius* to drive him from *Conſtantinople* a Second time, and baniſh him to *Cucuſus*, an inhoſpitable Place in *Cilicia*. The News of theſe laſt Proceedings had not yet reached *Rome*, when *Theophylus* ſent one of his Lectors with a Letter to *Innocent*, acquainting him, that he had depoſed *Chryſoſtom*. As, in this Letter, *Theophylus* obſerved an intire Silence with reſpect to the Motives that had prompted him to take ſuch a Step, *Innocent* prudently forbore returning him an Anſwer. There happened to be then at *Rome* a Deacon of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, who, hearing what *Theophylus* had wrote, went immediately, and warned *Innocent* to be upon his Guard, intreating him at the ſame time, not to proceed, but with the utmoſt Caution, in ſo nice and important an Affair, and aſſuring him, that the Truth could not remain long undiſcovered. Accordingly, in Three Days, *Panſovius*, and Three other Biſhops, arrived at *Rome*, with Three Letters for *Innocent*; *viz.* one from *Chryſoſtom* himſelf, another from the Biſhops of his Communion, and the Third from the whole Clergy of *Conſtantinople*. *Chryſoſtom* in his Letter, which is ſtill to be ſeen in his Works, and in thoſe of *Palladius*, who wrote the Hiſtory of his Perſecution, after giving *Innocent* an Account of the Storm his Enemies had raiſed againſt him, intreateth him to declare ſuch wicked Proceedings void and null, to pronounce all who had any Share in them puniſhable, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Laws, and to continue to him the Marks of his Charity and Communion. In the Title and Cloſe of the Letter, he addreſſeth himſelf to one, but every-where elſe to more Perſons, the Letter having been wrote, as appeareth from the Copy in *Palladius* [y],

[y] Pall. Dial. c. 2.

not to *Innocent* alone, but to him, to *Venerius* of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* of *Aquileia*, Bishops of the Three chief Sees in the West.

Innocent's *Answer to* Chrysostom's *Letter.*

Innocent, acting with his usual Prudence and Circumspection, in his Answer to the above-mentioned Letters, declared, that he admitted the Bishops of both Parties to his Communion, from which he could exclude no Man until he was lawfully judged and condemned; and that therefore, to compose all Differences, and leave no room for Complaints on either Side, it was fit a Council should be assembled, consisting of the Western as well as the Eastern Bishops. The other Bishops of *Italy*, to whom *Chrysostom* had wrote, returned much the same Answer [z], following therein the Advice, which *Chrysostom* himself had given to the Bishops of his Party; *viz.* that they should communicate with his Enemies, to prevent Divisions in the Church, but not sign his Condemnation, because he did not think himself guilty [a]. *Innocent*'s Answer to *Theophylus* was in Words to the same Effect. His Letter to *Chrysostom* was carried into the East by *Demetrius* Bishop of *Pessinus*, who took care to shew it every-where, to the end it might be every-where known, that the *Roman* Church still communicated with that holy Bishop [b].

Theophilus *writeth to* Innocent.

A few Days after *Innocent* had answered *Chrysostom*'s Letter, *Petrus* one of *Theophylus*'s Presbyters, and *Martyrius* Deacon of the Church of *Constantinople*, arrived at *Rome*, with Letters from *Theophylus*, and the Acts of *Chrysostom*'s Deposition by the Council *ad Quercum*. From these it appeared, that the Council had consisted of Thirty-six Bishops, whereof Twenty-nine were *Egyptians*, and over these *Theophylus* had, as their Metropolitan, too great an Influence; that *Chrysostom* had been condemned without being heard, and that nothing had been laid to his Charge, deserving so severe and exemplary a Punishment. *Innocent* therefore, having read them, with the utmost Indignation, answered *Theophylus* in a few Words; that

Innocent's *Answer to* Theophylus.

[z] Idem ib. c. 8. [a] Idem ib. [b] Idem ib. c. 3.

that he was determined, as he had notified to him by his former Letter, to communicate both with him and his Brother *John*; that he could by no means depart from the Communion of the latter, until he was lawfully judged and condemned; that a Council was to be ſoon held, before which it was incumbent upon *Theophylus* to make good his Charge, and the Steps he had hitherto taken, by the Canons and Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, ſince the *Roman* Church admitted no others[c]. With this Letter *Petrus* and *Martyrius* returned to *Conſtantinople*, whence arrived at *Rome*, ſoon after their Departure from that City, *Theoctecnus*, a Preſbyter of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, and one of *Chryſoſtom*'s Friends, with Letters from Twenty-five Biſhops, informing *Innocent*, that *Chryſoſtom* had been driven a Second time from his See; that he had been conducted by a Band of Soldiers to *Cucuſus*, and confined to that Place; and that the great Church had been conſumed by Fire, the very Day he was carried out of *Conſtantinople*. *Innocent* was greatly affected with this Account, and ſhed many Tears in reading it. But as theſe Troubles and Diſorders were fomented by ſome great Men, at the Court either of *Arcadius* or *Honorius*, and a Miſunderſtanding was then ſubſiſting between the Two Brothers, or their Miniſters, he concluded, that his Endeavours towards the reſtoring of Peace and Unity would prove unſucceſsful, and might even blow the Fire, which already burnt with ſo much Violence, into a greater Flame. On theſe Conſiderations he wiſely forbore making any Application for the preſent to *Honorius*, and only ſent Letters of Communion to *Chryſoſtom*, and the Biſhops who had eſpouſed his Cauſe[d]. Theſe Letters were delivered to *Theoctecnus*, who was ſcarce gone, when one *Paternus*, who ſtyled himſelf a Preſbyter of the Church of *Conſtantinople*, arrived at *Rome*, with Letters from *Acacius*, who had been intruded into the

Letters from the Biſhops of Chryſoſtom's *Party to* Innocent.

Who ſends Letters of Communion to them.

Letters from Acacius *and* Innocent.

[c] Idem ib. [d] Pallad. ib. c. 2.

See of *Constantinople*, and from some other Bishops of his Party, charging *Chrysostom* with setting Fire to the *Basilic* or Great Church. So barefaced a Calumny provoked *Innocent* to such a Degree, that he would neither hear *Paternus*, nor return an Answer to the Letters he had brought.

Chrysostom's Friends cruelly persecuted.

In the mean time a most cruel Persecution was raised at *Constantinople*, against *Chrysostom*'s Friends, refusing to communicate with *Acacius*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*, who had intruded himself into the vacant See of *Antioch*, and, in Defiance of the Canons, maintained, by Force of Arms, the Dignity he had usurped. This Persecution was carried on under a Christian Emperor, with as much Cruelty as any had ever been under the most inveterate Enemies of the Christian Name. The Pretence they made use of was to discover the Authors of the late Fire; and as the Imperial Officers chiefly suspected, or pretended to suspect, *Chrysostom*'s Friends, *Optatus*, who was then Prefect or Governor of *Constantinople*, and a Pagan, laid hold of that Opportunity to vent upon them the implacable Hatred he bore to the Religion they professed. Many therefore, without Distinction of Sex or Condition, were, by his Orders, dragged to the public Goals, and confined there to Dungeons, others tormented with such Barbarity as to expire on the Rack; and great Numbers, after having undergone repeated Tortures, stript of all their Effects, and banished to the most remote and desolate Places of the Empire.

Many fly to Rome.

At the same time the Emperor *Arcadius*, strangely prepossessed against *Chrysostom*, and those of his Communion, caused Two Edicts to be published; the one directed to the Governors of the Provinces, whom he strictly injoined not to suffer, in their respective Jurisdictions, any private Assemblies or Meetings of Persons, who, despising the Churches, worshiped elsewhere, lest they should seem to communicate with *the most Reverend Prelates of the holy Law*,

Law, *Arſacius*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*. The other commanded ſuch Biſhops as refuſed to communicate with them, to be driven from their Sees, and their Effects to be ſeized. The Perſecution, which ſtill raged, although it was ſoon after ſtopt at the Remonſtrances of *Studius* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, and the Severity, with which the Two Imperial Edicts were put in Execution, drove great Numbers, both of the Clergy and Laity, from *Conſtantinople*, and the Provinces ſubject to *Arcadius*. Among the former were *Cyriacus* Biſhop of *Synnada*, *Eulyſius* of *Apamea* in *Bithynia*, *Palladius* of *Helenopolis*, *Germanus* a Preſbyter, and *Caſſianus* a Deacon, who afterwards embraced the Monaſtic Life, and became famous for his Aſcetic Writings. *Eulyſius* brought Letters to *Innocent* from Fifteen Biſhops of *Chryſoſtom*'s Communion, acquainting him with the deplorable State of the *Conſtantinopolitan* Church, and one from *Anyſius* of *Theſſalonica*, declaring, that, in the preſent unhappy Diviſions, he had reſolved to conform intirely to the Sentiments of the *Roman* Church. *Germanus* and *Caſſianus* likewiſe delivered Letters to *Innocent*, written in the Name of the whole Clergy of *Conſtantinople*, and giving him an Account of the Perſecution that ſtill raged, and of the cruel Treatment their Biſhop had met with [a]. *Innocent*, in his Anſwer to this Letter, expreſſeth, in the moſt pathetic Terms, his Concern for the unhappy State of that Church, and their Sufferings; he encourages them to bear, with Patience, their preſent Tribulation and Afflictions, nay, and with Joy, ſince it is for the ſake of Juſtice they ſuffer, and are thus perſecuted: he complaineth of the undue Depoſition of his Collegue, and Inſtallation of another in his Lifetime, which he ſheweth to be againſt the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, the only Canons admitted and obeyed by the *Roman* Church: he concludeth with informing

Several Biſhops, and the whole Clergy of Conſtantinople *write to* Innocent.

His Anſwer to the Clergy.

[a] Pall. ubi ſupra. Soz. l. 8. c. 26. Hiſt. Lauſiac. c. 121.

informing them, that as he had always thought it neceſſary, that an Oecumenical Council ſhould aſſemble, he had long conſidered, and was ſtill conſidering, by what Means it might be aſſembled, *ſince a Council, and nothing elſe, could appeaſe ſo violent a Storm*, and reſtore to the Church the ſo much wiſhed for Tranquillity [b].

Innocent *applies to* Honorius.

Two Preſbyters in the mean time came to *Rome* from the Eaſt, *Domitianus* of *Conſtantinople*, and *Vallagus* of *Niſibis* in *Meſopotamia*, and brought with them the original Acts, which they had purchaſed with a large Sum, of the Imperial Officers, containing an authentic Detail of the Cruelties which ſome Women of Quality had been made to endure for not communicating with *Arſacius*, and the Biſhops of his Faction. With theſe the good Biſhop was ſo deeply affected, that he could no longer forbear applying to *Honorius*, who, at his Requeſt, wrote immediately to *Arcadius* a very preſſing and friendly Letter in favour of *Chryſoſtom*, and thoſe of his Communion. At the ſame time he iſſued an Order for convening a Council of the Weſtern Biſhops, who, meeting ſoon after at *Rome*, drew up an Addreſs, which they ſent to *Ravenna*, where the Emperor then was, earneſtly intreating him to interpoſe anew his good Offices with his Brother *Arcadius*, that an Oecumenical Council might be allowed to aſſemble at *Theſſalonica*, in order to compoſe the preſent Differences, which had already produced a Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches, and might in the end bring on an intire Separation. *Honorius*, in Compliance with their Requeſt, wrote a Third Letter to *Arcadius* (for he had, it ſeemeth, wrote already a Second), and at the ſame time one to *Innocent*, deſiring him to appoint Five Biſhops, Two Preſbyters of the *Roman* Church, and One Deacon, to carry his Letter into the Eaſt, thinking that ſuch a Legation would

who writes to Arcadius.

[b] Soz. ubi ſupra, & ep. Rom. Pont. Inn. 15.

would add no ſmall Weight to his Mediation. The Letter to *Arcadius* was in the following Terms:

" This is the Third time I write to your Meek- *His Letter.*
" neſs (*ad Manſuetudinem tuam*) intreating you to
" correct and rectify the iniquitous Proceedings that
" have been carried on againſt *John* Biſhop of *Con-*
" *ſtantinople*. But nothing, I find, hath been hi-
" therto done in his Behalf. Having therefore
" much at Heart the Peace of the Church, which
" will be attended with that of our Empire, I write
" to you anew by theſe holy Biſhops and Preſbyters,
" earneſtly deſiring you to command the Eaſtern
" Biſhops to aſſemble at *Theſſalonica*. The Weſtern
" Biſhops have ſent Five of their Body, Two Preſ-
" byters of the *Roman* Church, and One Deacon,
" all Men of the ſtricteſt Equity, and quite free
" from the Byaſs of Favour and Hatred. Theſe I
" beg you would receive with that Regard which is
" due to their Rank and Merit: if they find *John* to
" have been juſtly depoſed, they may ſeparate me
" from his Communion; and you from the Com-
" munion of the Orientals, if it appears that he hath
" been unjuſtly depoſed. The Weſtern Biſhops
" have very plainly expreſſed their Sentiments, in
" the many Letters they have wrote to me on the
" Subject of the preſent Diſpute. Of theſe I ſend
" you Two, the one from the Biſhop of *Rome*, the
" other from the Biſhop of *Aquileia*, and with them
" the reſt agree. One thing I muſt above all beg
" of your Meekneſs; that you oblige *Theophylus* of
" *Alexandria* to aſſiſt at the Council, how averſe ſo-
" ever he may be to it; for he is ſaid to be the firſt
" and chief Author of the preſent Calamities. Thus
" the Synod, meeting with no Delays or Obſtructi-
" ons, will reſtore Peace and Tranquillity in our
" Days [c]."

With theſe Letters the Legates ſet out from *Rome*, attended by the above-mentioned Prelates *Demetrius*, *Cyriacus*, *The Pope's Legates not allowed to touch at Theſſalonica*

[c] Pall. ibid.

Cyriacus, *Eulysius*, and *Palladius*; and, sailing for *Greece*, put in at *Athens*, with a Design to pursue their Voyage to *Thessalonica*, having Letters from *Innocent* to *Anysius* Bishop of that City. But at *Athens* they were, to their great Surprize, stopt and detained by a Military Tribune, who let them know that they must not touch at *Thessalonica*; and at the same time appointed a Centurion as a Guard over them, strictly injoining him not to suffer them, under any Pretence whatsoever, to approach that City. Soon after the Tribune parted them, and, putting them on board Two Vessels, ordered the Mariners to convey them strait to *Constantinople*. *Anysius* communicated with *Chrysostom*, as I have observed above; and it was, without all doubt, on this Consideration, that the Legates were not allowed to set foot in his Diocese. They arrived at *Constantinople* the Third Day after they had left *Athens*, but starved with Hunger; for the Tribune had neither supplied them with Provisions when they embarked, nor allowed them Time to supply themselves; so that they had tasted no Kind of Victuals during the Three Days they were at Sea. On their Arrival at *Constantinople*, they were not suffered to come ashore there, but ordered to a Castle on the *Thracian* Coast called *Athyra*, where they were all closely confined, the Legates in one common Room, and the other Bishops in so many separate Cells. As the People of *Constantinople* were most zealously attached to *Chrysostom*, the Emperor apprehended, and with a great deal of Reason, that their entering the City, and conversing publicly there, might be attended with uncommon Disturbances and Commotions; and therefore thought it adviseable to keep them at a Distance, and under Confinement. They had not been long thus confined, when they were ordered, they knew not by whom, to deliver the Letters they had brought. But neither by this Person, whoever he was, nor by several others, who were successively sent

The hard Usage they met with on their Journey,

and at Constantinople.

ſent on the ſame Errand, could they be prevailed upon to part with them; alleging, that Letters from an Emperor ought to be delivered to none but an Emperor.

As they continued firm and unſhaken in this Reſolution, one *Valerian*, a Military Tribune, was at laſt called in, and ordered to employ the Rhetoric peculiar to his Profeſſion, ſince no other could prevail. *Valerian* accordingly, after a ſhort Preamble, proceeded to Violence; and, ſeizing them, took the Letters by Force, having in the Struggle wounded one of the Biſhops in the Hand. The next Day they were viſited by a Perſon, who, without acquainting them who he was, or by whom ſent, offered them a very conſiderable Sum, on condition they would communicate with *Atticus*, who, upon the Death of *Arſacius*, had, by the Biſhops of his Faction, been intruded in his room. Upon their rejecting, as they did, with the utmoſt Indignation, this Offer, *Valerian*, who was preſent, conducted them under a ſtrong Guard to the Sea-ſide, and there put them on board an old leaky Veſſel, having firſt, with a large Bribe, prevailed upon the Commander, as they were informed, to engage his Word that they ſhould not outlive that Voyage. They outlived it however, and having reached *Lampſacus*, they embarked on board another Veſſel, which landed them ſafe at *Otranto*. As for the Eaſtern Biſhops, who had attended them from *Rome*, viz. *Cyriacus*, *Eulyſius*, *Palladius*, and *Demetrius*, after having been ſome time kept under cloſe Confinement at *Athyra*, they were baniſhed to the moſt remote and abandoned Places of the Empire. The other Biſhops, who refuſed to communicate with *Atticus*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*, fared no better, being in like-manner either driven into Baniſhment, or obliged to abſcond, and, under the Diſguiſe of Mechanics, earn their Livelihood by the meaneſt Profeſſions. Many periſhed in the Places of their Exile for want of Neceſ-

The Letters taken from them by Force.

They are put on board a leaky Veſſel;

but arrive ſafe in Italy.

ſaries;

saries; and others were so cruelly harassed, nay, and barbarously beaten, by the merciless Soldiery appointed to conduct them, that they died on the Road [d]. Such were the wretched Effects of that unchristian Principle of Persecution being lawful to punish Error in religious Disputes, which all Sects of Christians then held, and all suffered by in their Turns, as the different Parties among them got the Civil Magistrate and Force on their Side.

Honorius *resolves to revenge the Affront offered his Embassadors, but is diverted from it.*

Honorius, being informed of the base Treatment the Legates had met with, although vested with the sacred Character of Embassadors, was so provoked at such a notorious Violation of the Right of Nations, that he resolved to make War on his Brother, and revenge it by Force of Arms. But from this Resolution he was diverted by a threatened Invasion of the *Barbarians*, and the seasonable Discovery of the famous *Stilicho*'s Treachery, which obliged him to keep all his Troops in *Italy*, or the adjoining Provinces. As for *Innocent*, finding the Mediation of *Honorius*, which he had procured, prove unsuccessful, and no other Means left of affording the least Relief to *Chrysostom* and the other persecuted Bishops, he resolved to make known to the World his Abhorrence of the Evils, which it was not in his Power to redress; and accordingly separated himself from the Communion of *Atticus*, *Theophylus*, and *Porphyrius*, as the chief Authors of the present Calamities [e].

Arcadius *and* Eudoxia *not excommunicated by* Innocent.

Baronius, thinking it inconsistent with the Dignity of his High Pontiff thus tamely to bear with the insulting Conduct of *Arcadius*, would fain persuade us, that, after he had tried in vain all other Methods of bringing the Emperor, and the Empress *Eudoxia*, to a Sense of their Duty, he at last thought himself obliged to thunder against both the tremendous Sentence of Excommunication, cutting them off as rotten Members from the Body of the Faithful committed to his Care and Direction. To prove this, he produceth

[d] Pall. in dial. ubi supra. [e] Idem ibidem.

duceth ſeveral Letters from *Innocent* to *Arcadius*, and from *Arcadius* to *Innocent*, tranſcribed partly from *Gennadius*, *Glycas*, and *Nicephorus*, and partly from the *Vatican* Manuſcripts[f]. To enter into a critical Examination of thoſe Pieces would be waſting Time, and tiring the Reader to no Purpoſe. I ſhall therefore content myſelf with Three Obſervations, each of them ſufficient, in my Opinion, to make the World reject them all as mere Forgeries. In the firſt place, the Silence of the Hiſtorians, who wrote at that Time, touching ſo remarkable and unprecedented an Event as the Excommunication of an Emperor and an Empreſs, is an unanſwerable Confutation of every Proof that can be alleged to ſupport the Authenticity of the pretended Letters. For who can imagine that the Writers, who flouriſhed then, and have tranſmitted to us moſt minute Accounts of far leſs important Tranſactions both Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, would have paſſed this over in Silence? In the Second place, *Eudoxia* is ſuppoſed, in all thoſe Letters, to have outlived *Chryſoſtom*; whereas it is certain, that ſhe died in 404, four Years before him. Laſtly, In the above-mentioned Letter, *Arcadius* is all along ſuppoſed to have repented and changed his Conduct towards *Chryſoſtom*, to have perſecuted his Enemies as he had formerly done his Friends, and to have chiefly vented his Reſentment on the firſt Author of all the Diſturbances, the Empreſs, who thereupon, out of Grief, Rage, and Deſpair, fell into a dangerous Malady[g]. But of all this not the leaſt Hint is to be met with in *Palladius*, who wrote in the laſt Days of the Life and Reign of *Arcadius*; nay, that Hiſtorian ſpeaketh of the Friends of *Chryſoſtom* as Men ſtill under the Emperor's Diſpleaſure, and feeling the dreadful Effects of it in the inhoſpitable Places, to which they had been formerly confined.

From

[f] Bar. ann. 407. n. 19—22. [g] Vid. Bar. ubi ſup. Niceph. l. 13. c. 34. & Glyc. l. 4. p. 259, 260.

Chrysostom *did not appeal to the See of* Rome.

From the Conduct of *Chrysostom* on this Occasion, the *Roman-Catholic* Divines have taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that the Custom of appealing to the See of *Rome* obtained in his Time; that he actually appealed to that See; and consequently, that the Prerogative of receiving Appeals from all Parts, and finally deciding all Controversies, claimed by the Bishops of *Rome*, was then acknowleged even in the East. Nothing surely but the utmost Distress for want of other Instances to prove their Assertion, could have tempted them to make use of this; since, from the Conduct of *Chrysostom* on this very Occasion, nay, and from that of *Innocent* too, if set in their true Light, it may be undeniably made out, that this pretended Prerogative was utterly unknown to both. The Fact stands thus, and thus it is related by the Historians, who have transmitted it to us: *Chrysostom* is unjustly accused; the Bishop of *Alexandria* taketh upon him to inquire into his Conduct; assembleth a Council, consisting chiefly of *Egyptian* Bishops, and summoneth *Chrysostom* to appear before them: *Chrysostom* payeth no Regard to the Summons, protesteth against it, and will not allow the Bishops assembled to have any Power or Authority over him, *since it had been ordained by the Canons of the Church, that the Affairs of the Provinces should be regulated by the Bishops of the Provinces; and it was consequently very incongruous, that the Bishops of* Thrace *should be judged by those of* Egypt [k]. No Regard is had to his Protest, none to the Canons upon which it was grounded: he is summoned anew; and, not appearing within the limited Time, is judged, condemned, and deposed. From this Sentence he appealeth to a lawful Council; but, being, notwithstanding his Appeal, driven from his See, he recurreth at last to the Western Bishops, namely, to *Innocent* of *Rome*, *Venerius* of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* of *Aquileia*, intreating them not to abandon him in his Distress,

[k] Chrysos. ep. 122.

Diſtreſs, nor exclude him from their Communion [l], but to procure by all means the aſſembling of a General Council, in order to reſtore the Church to her former Tranquillity.

Such was the Conduct of *Chryſoſtom*: and, from this Conduct, doth it not manifeſtly appear, that *Chryſoſtom* was an utter Stranger to the pretended Power in the Biſhops of *Rome* of receiving Appeals from all other Tribunals, and finally determining all Controverſies? Who can think, that, had he been acquainted with ſuch a Prerogative, he would, when ſo unjuſtly oppreſſed, have appealed to a Council, which, he was well appriſed, would meet with great Obſtructions, when he had, ready at hand, a more certain and eaſy Method of finding Relief? Had he been ſatisfied, that *Innocent* had ſuch a Privilege, is it likely he would have wrote to him on ſo urgent an Occaſion, without taking the leaſt Notice of it; that he would have contented himſelf with only intreating him to procure the aſſembling of a General Council? Should a Biſhop now, apprehending himſelf injured by a National or Provincial Synod, appeal, not to the Pope, but, as *Chryſoſtom* did, to a General Council, he would, by ſuch an Appeal, draw upon himſelf the Indignation of the *Roman* See: for it would be thence concluded, and no Concluſion can be more natural, that he did not acknowlege the Power of receiving *Appeals* claimed by that See.

Chryſoſtom an utter Stranger to the Power of receiving Appeals in the Biſhops of Rome.

But *Chryſoſtom*, ſay they, did acknowlege ſuch a Power; for, in his Letter to *Innocent*, he intreateth him *to declare ſuch wicked Proceedings void and null, and to pronounce all, who had any Share in them, puniſhable, according to the Eccleſiaſtical Laws*. But *Chryſoſtom* addreſſeth himſelf here, not to *Innocent* alone, as I have already obſerved, but to him, in Conjunction with *Venerius* of *Milan*, and *Chromatius* of *Aquileia* [m]; nay, he addreſſeth himſelf, throughout the

Chryſoſtom never acknowleged ſuch a Power.

[l] Pall. dial. 2. [m] Idem ibid.

the whole Letter, to more Persons than one; and yet *Baronius* has the Assurance to stile the Letter an *Appeal* to *Innocent*[n]. And why to him, and not to the other Two, since he wrote nothing to him but what he wrote to them? *Bellarmine*, finding some Expressions in the above-mentioned Letter, which he thought might be so interpreted as to favour and countenance the Pretensions of the See of *Rome*, had *Chrysostom* addressed himself to *Innocent* alone, maketh him accordingly, by altering the Number in the Passage he quoteth, address himself to *Innocent* alone (A); and thence concludes, that even the *Grecks* acknowleged the Bishop of *Rome* for their Supreme Judge[o]. What must every impartial Man think of a Cause, that wanteth to be thus defended? What of those, who thus defend it?

The Disingenuity of Bellarmine.

About this time, that is in the Year 405, *Innocent*, being consulted by *Exuperius* (B) Bishop of *Toulouse*, concerning

Innocent's *Letter to* Exuperius *Bishop of* Toulouse.

[n] Bar. ad ann. 404. n. 20. [o] Bell. Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 15.

(A) He changeth *obsecro ut scribatis* into *obsecro ut scribas*.

(B) *Exuperius* was, as we gather from *Ausonius*, a Native of *Bourdeaux*, one of the greatest Orators of his Time, and had governed *Spain* in Quality of Prefect. He afterwards withdrew from the World, embraced the Ecclesiastical State in the Place of his Nativity (1); and was, for his eminent Virtues, raised to the See of *Toulouse*. He was chiefly commendable for his Charity to the Poor; although he bestowed the greater Part of it on Objects, perhaps, of all, the least worthy of his Compassion: for, by the Monk *Sisennius*, he sent considerable Sums into the East, to be distributed there among the Monks of *Egypt* and *Palæstine* (2); which might have been better employed at home, *Gaul* being then threatened with an Invasion of the *Vandals*, *Alans*, and other barbarous Nations; who, accordingly, broke into that Province on the last Day of the Year 406, and made themselves Masters of *Toulouse* itself. It was, however, this Kindness of *Exuperius* to the Monks, that chiefly recommended him to *Jerom* (3), who often mentioneth him with the greatest Commendations (4), and even inscribed to him his Comment on *Zechariah*.

(1) Paulin. ep. 20. (2) Hier. præf. in lib. 1. 2, & 3. Zach. & ep. 152. (3) Idem ibid. (4) Idem ep. 410, 411.

concerning ſome Points of Diſcipline, anſwered him by a Decretal, containing the following Deciſions: 1. That the Prieſts and Deacons, who were daily employed in ſacrificing or baptizing, were not to be allowed the Uſe of Matrimony; that thoſe, who were ignorant of the Decretal iſſued by *Syricius*, might be forgiven, upon their promiſing thenceforth to live continent; but, as to the reſt, they ſhould, as unworthy of Indulgence, be depoſed. The Second Article relateth to thoſe, who, after Baptiſm, had led a wicked or ſinful Life, and at the Point of Death deſired the Communion. *Innocent* declares, that to ſuch, according to the antient Diſcipline of the Church, which was more ſevere, Repentance was granted, and not the Communion; but, according to the preſent Practice, both were granted. By Repentance is here meant, according to the moſt probable Opinion, a Reconciliation with the Church; and, by the Communion, the Euchariſt, which the Thirteenth Canon of the Council of *Nice* commandeth to be given to all dying Perſons who deſire it. Some doubted whether it was lawful for a Chriſtian to diſcharge the Office of a Judge, in criminal Caſes. *Innocent* therefore declareth, in the Third Article, that no Penance ought to be impoſed upon thoſe who had condemned Criminals to the Rack, or even to Death, the Civil Power having been eſtabliſhed by God for the Puniſhment of Criminals. As Women were, it ſeemeth, more frequently puniſhed for Adultery than Men, ſome imagined that Crime not to be alike puniſhable in both. This Notion *Innocent* confuteth in the Fourth Article; adding, that Women were more frequently puniſhed, merely becauſe the Huſbands were more forward in accuſing their Wives, than Wives were in accuſing their Huſbands. The Fifth Article is a Confirmation of the Third; for it only abſolveth from all Sins ſuch as are obliged, by their Office, to proſecute or condemn Criminals. The Sixth Article excludeth

excludeth from the Communion of the Church all Men, who, after they have been parted from their Wives, marry other Women; and all Women, who, after they have been parted from their Husbands, marry other Men (A). The same Punishment is, by this Article, inflicted on those who marry them, but not on their Parents or Relations, provided they have been no way accessory to that unlawful Contract. The last Article containeth a Catalogue of the Canonical Books of Scripture, the same as are still acknowleged by the Church of *Rome* as Canonical. In the same Article, some Books are pointed out, that

(A) The matrimonial Bond is held, by the Church of *Rome*, indissoluble, and a Separation only allowed as to Bed and Board, even in Cases of Adultery; whence it follows, that so long as they both live, neither can marry, without being guilty of Adultery. There are, however, some *annulling Impediments*, as the Canonists style them, that is, Circumstances rendering the Marriage-contract null; and if any of these intervene, and is made to appear, the Parties are then declared not to have been married; and, consequently, free to marry whom they please. Until *Innocent*'s Time, Men, who had been parted from their Wives convicted of Adultery, were allowed to marry again. This *Epiphanius* telleth us in express Terms; adding, that, agreeably to Scripture (no doubt to *Matt.* v. 32), it could be no Crime to marry again; that those who married again were not excluded, on that score, from Life everlasting; and consequently ought not to be excluded from the Communion of the Church (1). The Scope and Design of *Epiphanius*, throughout his Work, was to acquaint us with the several Heresies that sprung up in the Church, and to explain, in Opposition to them, the Catholic Doctrines. It must therefore have been deemed a Heresy in his Time, that is, towards the latter End of the Fourth Century, to think the matrimonial Bond indissoluble, even in Cases of Adultery, or to hold it unlawful for a Man to marry again, who had put away his Wife *for the Cause of Fornication.* But the Heresy became afterwards a Catholic Truth, and the Catholic Truth a Heresy. This Change, however, was not so much owing to *Innocent*'s Decretal, as to the two Books, which St. *Austin* wrote about the Year 419, to prove, that it is unlawful for a Husband, who hath put away his Wife, even for Adultery, or for a Wife who hath been thus put away, to marry again, while both are living. He foundeth his Opinion on that of St. *Paul*, *The Wife is bound by the Laws, as long*

(1) Epiph. hæres. 59.

that ought to be abſolutely condemned and rejected [p] (B). Theſe Directions, or Inſtructions, *Innocent* pretendeth to have drawn partly from Scripture, and partly from Tradition; and thanketh *Exuperius*, becauſe he had, by applying to him for a Solution to his Difficulties, engaged him to examine them with Attention, and thereby given him an Opportunity of learning what he had not known before. It is ſurpriſing he ſhould have mentioned the Scripture, ſince the very Firſt Article, debarring for ever married Men from the Uſe of Matrimony, is an open Contradiction to the Directions given by St. *Paul* to all married Perſons, without Reſtraint or Diſtinction; *Defraud you not one the other, except it be*

[p] Conc t. 2. p. 1254—1256.

long as her Husband liveth (2). But, inſtead of underſtanding that Paſſage with the Exception made by our Saviour himſelf, *Whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife, ſaving for the Cauſe of Fornication*, &c. he endeavoureth, by many logical Diſtinctions, and unnatural Interpretations, to remove that Exception, although expreſſed by the Evangeliſt in the plaineſt Terms. He was therein, no doubt, miſled, by the groundleſs, but then reigning, Notion of an extraordinary Merit annexed to Celibacy; and therefore endeth his Work with exhorting the Huſbands, who have put away their Wives, to obſerve Continency, in Imitation of the Eccleſiaſtics, who obſerve it (ſaith he) with the greateſt Exactneſs, although it was not by their own Choice that ſome of them went into Orders. It may be queſtioned, whether, even then, the Continence of the unmarried Clergy was ſuch as he repreſenteth it.

(B) Theſe were ſeveral Books, ſtyled *The Acts of the Apoſtles*, forged by *Leucius*, *Nezocharis*, and *Leonides*, and aſcribed by them to ſome of the Apoſtles. *Leucius* was, by Sect, a *Manichee*, as appeareth from *Auſtin*, who confuted his Books (3). *Nezocharis* and *Leonides* are, by *Innocent*, ſtyled Philoſophers. The Books of *Leucius*, in the latter End of the preſent Century, were anew declared Apocryphal by Pope *Gelaſius*: *The Books*, ſaith, he, in one of his Decretals, *compoſed by* Leucius, *a Diſciple of the Devil, are all Apocryphal* (4).

(2) 1 Corinth. vii. 39. (3) Aug. de fide contra Manich. (4) Gelaſ. in Decretal. de lib. Apocryph.

be with Consent for a time, &c. *and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your Incontinency* q.

His Letter to Anysius of Thessalonica

As the Bishops of *Rome* had, ever since the time of *Damasus*, taken upon them to appoint the Bishop of *Thessalonica* their Vicar for *East-Illyricum*, *Innocent* no sooner heard, that *Rufus* had been promoted to that See, vacant by the Death of *Anysius*, than he let all the Bishops in those Parts know, by a Circular Letter, probably directed to *Rufus* himself, that he conferred on him the same Dignity which his Predecessors had conferred on the other Bishops of *Thessalonica*. He wrote, at the same time, a private Letter to *Rufus*, containing some Instructions relating to the Exercise of his Vicarious Power, and, with them, the Names of the Provinces which he was to govern, as his Vicar and First Primate; but without intrenching, addeth *Innocent*, upon the Rights and Privileges of the Primate or Metropolitan of each Province. In this Letter he taketh great care, that *Rufus* should not forget he is indebted for such a Power to the See of *Rome*; for that he frequently repeateth, as if he entertained some Jealousy of *Rufus*, or apprehended that he might claim such a Power, as Bishop of *Thessalonica*, that City being, according to the Civil Division of the Empire, on which the Ecclesiastical was ingrafted, the Metropolis of *East-Illyricum* r.

Rome *reduced to great Streights by* Alaric.

The same Year 407, the Emperor *Honorius* visited the City of *Rome*, and continued there until the Month of *May* of the Year 708. On the 23d of the following *August*, *Stilicho* was killed; and *Alaric* the *Goth*, entering *Italy* soon after his Death, appeared before *Rome*, and laid close Siege to that City in the latter End of the same Year. As no Provisions could be conveyed into the Place, all the Avenues being shut up and well guarded, a Famine soon ensued, and upon the Famine a Plague, which daily swept off great Numbers of the Inhabitants. In this Extremity, such of the Senators as still adhered to the

q 1. Corinth. vii. 5. r Holsten. Coll. Rom. t. 1. p. 49-51.

the Pagan Superſtitions, promiſing themſelves Relief from the Gods of their Anceſtors, reſolved to implore their Protection, by ſolemn Sacrifices offered up to them in the Capitol, and other public Places of the City. This Reſolution, ſaith *Zoſimus* [r], they imparted to *Innocent*, then Biſhop of *Rome*, who, ſacrificing his private Opinion to the public Welfare, agreed to it, on Condition that the Ceremony ſhould be privately performed. Of theſe Sacrifices *Sozomen* too taketh particular Notice [t]; but maketh no Mention of *Innocent*, which hath induced ſome to ſuſpect the Veracity of *Zoſimus*, who was, as is well known, a ſworn Enemy to the Chriſtian Religion. But that thoſe Sacrifices were performed, is affirmed both by him and *Sozomen*; and it is not at all probable, that *Pompeianus*, who was then Governor of *Rome*, and a Chriſtian, would have ſuffered them, without the Conſent and Approbation of *Innocent*. However that be, I ſee not why *Baronius* ſhould be ſo provoked againſt *Zoſimus*, for making *Innocent* thus connive at the ſuperſtitious Worſhip of the Gentiles, ſince his Succeſſors have always allowed, and do ſtill allow, oven in *Rome* itſelf, the free Exerciſe of the *Jewiſh* Worſhip.

The Pagan Superſtitions connived at by Innocent.

Rome being reduced to the laſt Extremity, Deputies were, in the End, ſent out to treat with *Alaric*, who, hearkening to their Propoſals, raiſed the Siege, upon their paying to him Five thouſand Pounds Weight of Gold, Thirty thouſand of Silver, Four thouſand Silk Garments, Three thouſand Skins of Purple Dye, and as many Pounds of Pepper. At the ſame time the *Romans* engaged to mediate a Peace between him and *Honorius*: but the Emperor refuſing to comply with the Terms that were propoſed, although no ways unreaſonable, the *Roman* Senate ſent Two ſolemn Deputations to *Ravenna*, where *Honorius* then reſided, to lay before him the Danger to which he expoſed the Empire, and perſuade

Innocent *leaves* Rome, *and repairs to the Emperor at* Ravenna.

[r] Zoſ. l. 5. c. 40. [t] Soz. l. 9. c. 6.

ſuade him to accept the Conditions offered him both by them and by *Alaric*. As the Firſt Deputation proved unſucceſsful, *Innocent*, thinking his Preſence might give ſome Weight to the Negotiations, left *Rome*, and, together with the Deputies, repaired to *Ravenna*. Thus he eſcaped the Mortification of ſeeing the City of *Rome* taken and plundered by the Barbarians [u]. For *Honorius* ſtill rejecting the Terms of Peace, *Alaric* returned with his Army before *Rome*; and, having made himſelf Maſter of it on the 24th of *Auguſt* of the Year 410, treated the great Metropolis of the Empire no better, if *Jerom* may be credited, than the *Greeks* are ſaid to have treated antient *Troy* [w].

Innocent's Letter to Marcianus, Biſhop of Naiſſus.

While *Innocent* continued at *Ravenna*, he wrote to *Marcianus*, Biſhop of *Naiſſus*, a City in *Mœſia*, concerning the Eccleſiaſtics of his Dioceſe, who had been ordained by *Bonoſus*, of whom we have ſpoken above [x]. In that Letter, *Innocent* declares, that *Marcianus* ought to admit to his Communion, and even reſtore to their Churches, thoſe Eccleſiaſtics, who, having adhered to *Bonoſus*, after his Condemnation, were willing to return, provided they had been ordained by him before his Condemnation. One of theſe, by Name *Ruſticus*, to remove all Doubt concerning the Validity of his Ordination, had cauſed himſelf to be reordained by a Catholic Biſhop; and this Reordination *Innocent* condemneth, in the ſame Letter, as highly criminal [y].

His Letter to Aurelius of Carthage.

In the Year 412, *Innocent* wrote to *Aurelius* Biſhop of *Carthage*, whom he ſeemeth to have greatly honoured and eſteemed, concerning the Day on which *Eaſter* was to be kept in the Year 414. He acquainteth *Aurelius*, that the 16th Day of the Moon of *March* would fall that Year on the 22d of the Month, and the 23d of the Moon on the 29th of the

[u] Zoſ. l. 5. p. 819—820. Soz. l. 9. c. 7. [w] Hier. ep. 16.
[x] Vid. ſup. p. 263—266. [y] Conc. t. 2. p. 1271.

the Month; and consequently that, in his Opinion, *Easter* ought to be kept on the 22d of *March*. However, he desireth *Aurelius* to discuss that Point in the Council of the *African* Bishops, that was in a short time to be held at *Carthage*; and to let him know, whether they approved of such a Regulation, or what they objected against it, that he might solemnly notify by his Letters, according to Custom, the Day, on which *Easter* was to be celebrated [z]. Their thus notifying to the other Bishops the Day on which *Easter* was to be kept, was no Argument of Power; but it gave them an Air of Pre-eminence, which they dexterously improved into Power.

The Letter of the Bishops of Macedon to Innocent.

In the Year 414, *Vitalis*, Archdeacon probably of *Thessalonica*, arrived at *Rome*, with Letters for *Innocent*, from the Bishops of *Macedon*, touching certain Points of Discipline, which, it seems, they had referred to him, and he had decided before. In this Letter they represent to him, in the first place, that, according to the Custom and Practice of their Churches, the marrying with a Widow was no Bar or Impediment to Orders, or even to the Episcopal Dignity; and that to marry one Wife before, and a Second after, Baptism, was not, with them, deemed Bigamy. Then passing to those, who had been ordained by *Bonosus*, they declare it as their Opinion, that nothing more could be required than the Blessing of a lawful Bishop to readmit them to the Functions of their Office. They conclude with begging Leave to raise to the Episcopal Dignity one *Photinus*, who had been condemned by the Predecessors of *Innocent*, and to depose a Deacon, by Name *Eustatius* [a].

Innocent's Answer.

This Letter *Innocent* answered, almost in the Style and Language of a modern Pope. He beginneth with expressing his Surprize at the Affront they offered to the Apostolic See, by calling in Doubt what he had already decided. He then answereth, one by one, the Heads of their Letter, with all the Autho-

[z] Conc. t. 2. p. 1264. [a] Conc. t. 2. p. 1272—1276.

rity of an unerring Judge, although neither he, nor any of his Predeceſſors, had ever yet claimed, or thought of claiming, ſuch a Prerogative. He abſolutely condemns the Practice of admitting to Orders ſuch as had married Widows, becauſe that was forbidden, ſaith he, by *Moſes* to the High Prieſt of the *Jews*; which was tacitly declaring the *Levitical* Laws to be ſtill, in ſome Degree, binding with reſpect to the Chriſtian Clergy. He adds, that if any ſuch had been ordained, it was the general Practice of all the Churches, both in the Eaſt and Weſt, to depoſe them (A). As for thoſe who had married but one of their Two Wives after Baptiſm, *Innocent* declares them equally incapable of being ordained as if they had married both (B). As to the Eccleſiaſtics ordained by *Bonoſus*, *Innocent* not only excludes them from the Miniſtry, but endeavoureth to prove in general, that Orders, when conferred by Heretics, are null, borrowing, for that Purpoſe of St. *Cyprian*, all the Arguments which that Father had made uſe of to prove a no leſs erroneous Opinion; *viz.* the Nullity of Baptiſm, when conferred by Heretics (C).

Innocent declareth Orders conferred by Heretics to be null.

The

(A) Such a Practice, however general, could have no other Foundation but the ſame unwarrantable Notion: I ſay, unwarrantable; for what can be more ſo than to exclude, as *Innocent* doth, even from the loweſt Degrees in the Church, a Man who had married a Widow, becauſe the High Prieſt of the *Jews* was not allowed to marry one, although all other Prieſts were, under that Law, free from ſuch a Reſtraint?

(B) *Jerom* held the contrary Opinion, and maintained it in one of his Letters (1), with Reaſons, that appeared to *Baronius almoſt unanſwerable* (2), that is, no otherwiſe anſwerable than by the *Ipſe dixit* of *Innocent*, which, with him, ſtood in the room of Reaſon.

(C) He was, it ſeemeth, no Logician; elſe, to prove his Opinion, he had never made uſe of Arguments, that equally proved, and had been calculated to prove, an erroneous Opinion, an Opinion long before condemned by all the Biſhops of the Catholic Church, and very lately by himſelf, in a Letter to *Alexander* Biſhop of *Antioch*, where he maintains the Validity of Baptiſm conferred by an *Arian* (3).

(1) Hier. ep. 83. (2) Bar. ad ann. 405. n. 60. (3) Inn. ep. 18.

The Opinion, which he endeavoureth to eſtabliſh here, hath been ſince condemned as heretical, by ſeveral of his Succeſſors, and is now held as ſuch by the whole Church; which hath cut out a great deal of Work for the Champions of Infallibility. They plainly ſee (and who can read *Innocent*'s Letter without ſeeing?) that the Reaſons which he made uſe of were all calculated to prove the Nullity of Ordination by the Hands of an Heretic; but nevertheleſs pretend, that whatever their ſeeming Purport may be, *Innocent* employed them only to prove, that an heretical Biſhop had not the Power of conferring Grace, and with it the Right of exerciſing lawfully the Functions of his Office [b]. But who can believe any Man, endowed with the leaſt Share of common Senſe, capable of arguing ſo abſurdly? If his Meaning may be thus wreſted, in ſpite of his Words, to a Catholic Senſe, whoſe Meaning may not?

Which Opinion hath been ſince declared heretical.

With reſpect to *Photinus*, *Innocent* declareth himſelf very unwilling to blame, or give Occaſion to the World to think that he blamed, the Conduct of his Predeceſſors, who had condemned *Photinus*; but nevertheleſs, ſince ſo many Prelates had made it appear by their joint Teſtimonies, that the Holy See had been impoſed upon by falſe and groundleſs Reports, he agreeth to his Promotion. As to the Deacon *Euſtatius*, he lets them know, that whatever Reports may have been ſpread to his Prejudice, he is well aſſured both of his Probity, and the Purity of his Faith, and therefore cannot conſent to his Depoſition. In the End of his Letter, he complaineth of the Biſhops of *Macedon* for not paying due Regard to the Teſtimony of the *Roman* Church, in behalf of the Two Subdeacons *Dizonianus* and *Cyriacus*.

Innocent owns the holy See to have been impoſed upon.

We have obſerved above, that *Chryſoſtom* being driven from the See of *Conſtantinople* into Exile, *Innocent*, and with him moſt of the Weſtern Biſhops, had eſpouſed his Cauſe with great Warmth; but, finding

The Miſunderſtanding between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches continues after the Death of Chryſoſtom.

[b] Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 10.

finding that all their Endeavours in his Behalf proved unſucceſsful, they at laſt ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of *Atticus* of *Conſtantinople*, *Porphyrius* of *Antioch*, and *Theophylus* of *Alexandria*. In the Year 407, *Chryſoſtom* died at *Cumana* in *Pontus*; but with him did not die the Animoſities, which his Depoſition had occaſioned between the Churches of the Eaſt and the Weſt. *Atticus* indeed thought nothing could now obſtruct the wiſhed-for Union; and therefore, as ſoon as *Chryſoſtom*'s Death was known, he applied to *Rome*, deſiring the Communion of that Church. But he was greatly ſurpriſed, when he underſtood, that *Innocent*, inſtead of readily granting him his Requeſt, inſiſted upon his firſt acknowleging *Chryſoſtom* to have been, and to have died, lawful Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, by inrolling his Name in the Diptychs (A), with the Names of other Biſhops of that City. This Demand ſeemed to *Atticus* highly unreaſonable; for it was obliging him to acknowlege his own Election to have been null. He therefore peremptorily refuſed to comply with it; but nevertheleſs continued ſoliciting, by means of his Friends at *Rome*, a Reconciliation with that Church [e]. But *Innocent* was inflexible; he was determined at all Events to carry his Point, and therefore would hearken to no other Terms until that was complied with. The Eaſtern Biſhops followed the Example of *Atticus*; the Weſtern that of *Innocent*. And thus were the Separation, and the Animoſities attending it, continued Seven Years longer, each Party bitterly inveighing, in the mean time, againſt the Authors of the Diviſion, and each expreſſing a moſt earneſt Deſire of a Reconciliation.

At

[e] Theodoret. l. 5. c. 34.

(A) The Diptychs were Tables, in which were inrolled the Names of all thoſe who died in the Communion of the Church. The Biſhops were placed there by themſelves, and of all Commemoration was made by the Deacon in the Time of the Service.

At length *Porphyrius* of *Antioch*, one of *Chryſoſtom*'s moſt inveterate Enemies, dying in the Year 413, or 414. *Alexander*, who until then had led a monaſtic Life, was choſen in his room by the unanimous Conſent of the People and Clergy. As he was fully convinced of *Chryſoſtom*'s Innocence, and the Malice of his Enemies, he no ſooner found himſelf veſted with that Dignity, than he cauſed the deceaſed Prelate's Name to be inſerted in the Diptychs of his Church, and the Two Biſhops *Helpidius* and *Pappus* to be reſtored to their Sees, from which they had been driven for refuſing to renounce his Communion, and to communicate with his Enemies. After this *Alexander* ſent a ſolemn Deputation to *Rome*, at the Head of which was, it ſeems, the famous *Caſſian*, to acquaint *Innocent* with his Promotion, to inform him of what he had done, and thereupon to renew the Union between the Two Churches. *Alexander*, who entertained a ſincere Deſire of ſeeing Peace and Concord reſtored between the Eaſt and the Weſt, did not doubt but the Example of his Church would be followed by many others, and a Way, by that Means, be paved to a general Pacification. *Innocent* received the Deputation with the greateſt Marks of Joy, admitted *Alexander* to his Communion, and, with the Conſent and Approbation of Twenty-four other Biſhops, declared the Church of *Antioch* again united to that of *Rome*.

The Churches of Antioch *and* Rome *reconciled.*

Several other Biſhops, moved partly by the Example, and partly by the Letters and Exhortations of the Biſhop of *Antioch*, yielded to *Innocent*, and ſubmitted to the Terms he required. But *Atticus* ſtill adhered to his former Reſolution, and, to gain him, *Alexander*, who ſpared no Pains to complete the Work he had begun, repaired in Perſon to *Conſtantinople*. But he acted there with ſuch Indiſcretion as rendered that haughty Prelate more averſe, than he had ever yet been, to an Accommodation on the Terms propoſed by *Innocent*. For all other Means he

The Biſhop of Antioch *ſtrives to reconcile the Churches of* Rome *and* Conſtantinople.

he could think of, to compass his Design, proving unsuccessful, he resolved in the End to apply to the Populace, who, as he well knew, had been most zealously attached to *Chrysostom* during his Life, and revered him as a Saint after his Death. Suffering therefore his Zeal to get the better of his Prudence, and of every Consideration Prudence could suggest, he began to harangue the Multitude, and inflame them with seditious Speeches against *Atticus*, as carrying, even beyond the Grave, his Hatred and Malice against their holy Bishop. The Populace heard him with Attention, applauded his Zeal, and, full of Rage against *Atticus*, demanded, in a tumultuous manner, that the Name of so holy, so great and deserving a Prelate, might be inrolled, without further Delay, in the Diptychs. But their Clamours and Threats made no more Impression on the Mind of *Atticus* than the Reasons of *Alexander*; he withstood both; and the Bishop of *Antioch*, finding all his Attempts thus shamefully baffled, returned to his See, with the Mortification of having only widened the Breach, which he intended to close, between the Churches of *Rome* and *Constantinople*[d]. *Baronius* supposeth *Alexander* to have acted on this Occasion as *Innocent*'s Legate[e]. But I find nothing in the Antients to countenance such a Supposition, besides his haughty Behaviour, and his pursuing, by the most unwarrantable Methods, what he had in View.

His Imprudent Conduct.

The Name of Chrysostom *inrolled in the Diptychs by the Bishop of* Constantinople.

Atticus, however, allowed, in the End, *Chrysostom*'s Name to be inserted in the Diptychs; but whether he did it by Choice or Compulsion, is uncertain; for, in one of his Letters, he writes, that he could no longer withstand the Threats and Violence of the enraged Multitude[f]; and, in another, that he had done it to comply with the Will of the Emperors, and to conform to the Sentiments of his Brethren, both in the East and the West[g]. However that be, it

[d] Niceph. l. 14. c. 27. [e] Bar. ad ann. 48. n. 32. [f] Niceph. c. 26. [g] Idem, c. 27.

it is certain, that he never changed his Sentiments with reſpect to *Chryſoſtom*, as is manifeſt from his declaring, after he had placed his Name in the Diptychs, that he thereby meant no more than to own, that he had been once Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*; but that he ſtill adhered to the Judgment that was given againſt him. With this, however, *Innocent* was ſatisfied; and ſo is *Baronius*.

The Two Churches re-united at laſt.

Alexander maintained ever after a cloſe Correſpondence with *Innocent*, courting his Favour with the moſt ſervile Submiſſions, recurring to him in every momentous Affair relating to his Church, and ſuffering himſelf to be blindly guided by his Counſels. In one of his Letters he conſulted him, it ſeemeth, concerning the Prerogatives of his See, and the Extent of his Juriſdiction; and nothing can be more ſubtile than *Innocent*'s Anſwer. For after a long Preamble on the Dignity of the See of *Antioch*, he craftily inſinuateth all the Privileges and Prerogatives annexed to it to be owing not to the Dignity of the City, but to the Dignity of the See, as having been once the See of St. *Peter*. He adds, that on this Conſideration it had been diſtinguiſhed with an extenſive Juriſdiction, and that it yielded to that of *Rome* itſelf only becauſe St. *Peter* had accompliſhed there what he had begun at *Antioch* [h]. What *Innocent* propoſed to himſelf by thus exalting the See of *Antioch*, by deriving the Privileges, Prerogatives, and Juriſdiction, of that See from St. *Peter*, is obvious. If they were owing not to the City, but to St. *Peter*, as *Innocent* affirms, thoſe enjoyed by the See of *Rome* were, in like-manner, owing to St. *Peter*, and not to the City. This Notion, now firſt ſtarted by *Innocent*, was not ſuffered to drop; but, being greedily embraced by his Succeſſors, it was, in Proceſs of Time, improved by them into a general Plea for all their exorbitant Claims. And thus *Innocent* may be juſtly ſaid to have pointed out the Ground on

Innocent's Letter to Alexander of Antioch.

The Prerogatives of the See of Rome owing to the City, and not to St. Peter.

[h] Conc. t. 2. p. 1269.

on which the unwieldy Fabric of the Papal Power was afterwards built. But if it be true, as *Innocent* pretends, that the See of *Antioch* owed its Dignity to St. *Peter*, and not to the City, how will he account for its being ranked under that of *Alexandria*, which was neither founded, nor had ever been honoured, by that Apoſtle? But, not to waſte Time in combating ſuch a groundleſs Notion, nothing is more certain than that the Diſpoſition and Diviſion of the Church was founded upon, and intirely agreeable to, the Diſpoſition and Diviſion of the Empire [i]; and conſequently that as no Regard was had to St. *Peter*, or any other Apoſtle, in the Civil, none could be had in the Eccleſiaſtical, Polity. And hence it naturally follows, that as *Rome* was the Firſt City of the Empire, *Alexandria* the Second, and *Antioch* the Third, the Sees ſhould be ranked in the ſame Order; and in the ſame Order they were ranked accordingly, although the See of *Alexandria* was founded only by a Diſciple of St. *Peter*, and that of *Antioch* was ſuppoſed to have been founded by St. *Peter* himſelf.

The Diviſion of the Church founded on the Diviſion of the Empire.

This Diviſion of the Church took place ſoon after the Diviſion of the Empire made by *Conſtantine the Great*, on which it was founded. It was firſt introduced by Cuſtom, but afterwards confirmed by ſeveral Councils, eſpecially by the General Council of *Chalcedon*, where it was decreed by the Twenty-eighth Canon, *That Biſhops ſhould have Precedence according to the Dignity of the Cities as ſettled by the ſecular Conſtitutions of the Empire.* Not a Word here of St. *Peter*. As therefore the Biſhop of *Alexandria* preceded in Rank the Biſhop of *Antioch*, for no other Reaſon but becauſe the City of *Alexandria* preceded in Dignity the City of *Antioch*, according to the ſecular Conſtitutions of the Empire; ſo the Biſhop of *Rome* preceded in Rank all other Biſhops, for no other Reaſon but becauſe the City of *Rome*, as the Seat of the Empire, preceded in Dignity all other Cities. But

[i] See above, p. 139, & ſeq.

But to return to *Innocent*: In the ſame Letter to *Alexander* he obſerves, that the Biſhop of *Antioch* did not preſide over a ſingle Province, but a whole Dioceſe; and therefore adviſeth him not only to maintain the Right he had of ordaining the Metropolitans, but not to ſuffer other Biſhops in the Provinces under his Juriſdiction, however diſtant, to be ordained without his Conſent and Approbation. He adds, that, with reſpect to the Biſhops of the leſs remote Provinces, he might reſerve to himſelf the Right of ordaining them [k]. This was encouraging the Biſhop of *Antioch* to invade and uſurp the undoubted Rights of the Metropolitans, in open Defiance of the Fourth and Sixth Canons of the Council of *Nice*, which were afterwards confirmed by almoſt innumerable other Councils, all granting to the Metropolitans the Power of ordaining the Biſhops of their reſpective Provinces jointly with the Biſhops of the ſame Province, without ever once mentioning the Patriarch or Head of the Dioceſe [l]. But of this Right the Biſhops of *Rome* had deprived the Metropolitans under their Juriſdiction as early at leaſt as the Time of *Syricius*; for that Pope, in the Letter which he wrote to *Anyſius* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, appointing him his Vicar for *Eaſt-Illyricum*, chargeth him not to ſuffer any Biſhops to be ordained in thoſe Provinces without his Conſent and Approbation. *Innocent* maintained what his Predeceſſors had uſurped; and, to countenance their Uſurpation and his own, he encourageth, by this Letter, the Biſhop of *Antioch* to purſue the ſame Conduct with reſpect to the Metropolitans of his Dioceſe. The Example of the Biſhops of *Rome* was, in Proceſs of Time, followed by thoſe of *Conſtantinople*, who, rivaling them in Pride and Ambition, not only uſurped the Power of ordaining all the Biſhops of their Dioceſe, but, by the

Innocent *encourages the Biſhop of* Antioch *to invade the Rights of the Metropolitans.*

[k] Concil. t. 2. p. 1269. [l] Vid. Ell. Du Pin. de antiq. eccleſ. diſciplin. diſſert. prim. n. 12.

the Intereſt they had at Court, obtained an Imperial Reſcript, confirming to them the Power which they had uſurped. But they were ſoon obliged to part with it, although thus guarantied, by the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* declaring, in the Twenty-fifth Canon of their laſt Seſſion, that the Metropolitans might ordain, and had a Right to ordain, the Biſhops in their reſpective Provinces, without the Conſent and Approbation of the Patriarch. But the Biſhops of *Rome*, ever determined to part with no Power, however acquired, found means not only to elude the Decrees of this and ſeveral other Councils, aſcertaining the Rights of the Metropolitans in the plaineſt Terms, but to improve, by daily Incroachments, their uſurped Juriſdiction, as I ſhall have frequent Occaſion to obſerve in the Sequel of this Hiſtory.

Innocent's Letter occaſions great Diſputes between the Biſhops of Antioch *and thoſe of* Cyprus.

Innocent complaineth, in the next Article, of his Letter, of a Cuſtom that obtained in the Iſland of *Cyprus*. It was one of the chief Privileges of the Patriarch, or Biſhop, who preſided over a whole Dioceſe, to ordain the Metropolitans of the Provinces compriſed under his Dioceſe. But the Metropolitan of *Cyprus* was ordained by the Biſhops of that Iſland without the Conſent, or even the Privity, of the Biſhop of *Antioch*, although *Cyprus* belonged to his Province, according to the Civil Diviſion of the Empire. This Cuſtom *Innocent* condemneth as repugnant to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*; adding, that it was firſt introduced in the unhappy Times when *Arianiſm* prevailed all over *Syria*, the Biſhops of *Cyprus* refuſing then to acknowlege thoſe of *Antioch*, who were infected with that Hereſy. This Article proved the Source of endleſs Diſputes between the Biſhops of *Antioch* and thoſe of *Cyprus*; the former pretending, that the Power of ordaining the Metropolitan of *Cyprus* was lodged in them, and the latter oppoſing with great Warmth ſuch a Pretenſion. The Controverſy was at length referred to the

Which are in the End decided in favour of the latter.

the Council of *Epheſus*; and the Fathers of that numerous Aſſembly, having heard and examined with great Attention the Pleas of both Parties, condemned in the ſtrongeſt Terms the Pretenſion of the Biſhops of *Antioch*, as repugnant to the antient Canons, that is, to thoſe very Canons, on which, at the Suggeſtion of *Innocent*, they had founded it. And here I cannot help obſerving, by the way, that the Biſhops of *Antioch* never thought of alleging, in ſupport of their Claim, the Authority of *Innocent*, which they would certainly have done, had they not been well appriſed, that no Regard would have been paid to it by the Fathers of the Council. As for what *Innocent* addeth, concerning the Time and Manner in which the Cuſtom he complaineth of was introduced, he muſt certainly have been no leſs miſtaken in thoſe Particulars, than he was in the Senſe and Meaning of the Canons of *Nice*. For who can imagine, that the *Arian* Biſhops, at the Time *Arianiſm* prevailed, that is, when they had the greateſt Intereſt at Court, and the Orthodox had none, would have ſuffered the Biſhops of *Cyprus* to withdraw themſelves, contrary to the eſtabliſhed Laws of the Church, from their Juriſdiction, for no other Reaſon, but becauſe the Biſhops of *Antioch* profeſſed the Doctrine of *Arius*?

Alexander, in his Letter to *Innocent*, had aſked him, Whether Two Metropolitan Sees ſhould be erected in one Province, which had been divided by the Emperors into Two? *Innocent* replies, That the Concerns of the Church being different from thoſe of the State, the Church ought to adhere to the antient Rule. However, it is plain from Hiſtory, that ſuch Alterations in the State were, generally ſpeaking, attended with the like Alterations in the Church; inſomuch that when the Biſhop of any conſiderable City wanted to be raiſed to the Dignity of a Metropolitan, the moſt expeditious Way of gratifying his Ambition was, to apply to the Emperor

Alterations in the State generally attended with the like Alterations in the Church.

peror for a Division of the Province; that his City being advanced, by such a Division, to the Rank of a Metropolis, he might, by the same Means, be preferred to that of a Metropolitan. Of mere Bishops, thus raised to the Dignity of Metropolitans, without any Regard to *Innocent*'s Letter, or, as it is styled, Decretal, several Instances occur in History.

Ecclesiastics ordained by Heretics to be admitted into the Church only as Laymen.

Innocent, in the End of his Letter, declareth it as his Opinion, that such Ecclesiastics as had renounced *Arianism*, or any other Heresy, with a Desire of being received into the Church, ought not to be admitted as Ecclesiastics, but only as Laymen. This Doctrine is intirely agreeable to the erroneous Doctrine concerning the Invalidity of Ordination by the Hands of an Heretic, which we have heard him labouring to establish in his Letter to the Bishops of *Macedon*[l]. He concludes this Letter with intreating the Bishop of *Antioch* to cause it to be read in a Council, or to see that Copies of it be transmitted to all the Bishops of his Diocese, that all may agree in observing the Instructions which it containeth [m].

Innocent's Letter to the Bishop of Eugubium.

But of all *Innocent*'s Letters, that which he wrote to *Decentius* Bishop of *Eugubium* (a City still known by the same Name in the Duchy of *Urbino*) is by far the most worthy of Notice, whether we consider the Doctrine which he there layeth down, or the Principles on which he foundeth it. As to the Doctrine, it may be reduced to the Two following Heads; *viz.* That all the Churches in the West are bound to adopt, and strictly to observe, every Practice and Custom observed by the *Roman* Church; and that the Customs of all other Churches, differing from those of the *Roman* Church, are but Corruptions of the antient Tradition, Deviations from the Practice of the Primitive Times, and insufferable Abuses. As for the Principles on which he founds this Doctrine, they are, to say no more, of a-piece with the Doctrine itself. For he pretends, 1. That no Apostle, besides

[l] Vide supra, p. 310. [m] Concil. t. 2. p. 1265---1269.

beſides St. *Peter*, ever preached in the Weſt. He ought, with St. *Peter*, to have at leaſt excepted St. *Peter*, and, no doubt, would, had not his Memory failed him, as well as his Infallibility. He ſuppoſeth, in the Second place, That all the Churches in the Weſt were founded by St. *Peter*, or by ſome of his Succeſſors; and conſequently, that they ought to conform to the Cuſtoms of the *Roman* Church, ſince to that Church they owe their Origin. But that the Church of *Lyons*, not to mention others, was founded by Preachers ſent thither out of *Aſia* by St. *Polycarp*, and not by St. *Peter*, or any of his Succeſſors, is affirmed by all the Antients, and allowed by the moſt learned among the Moderns; although ſome of them pretended, without the leaſt Foundation, the Whole to have been done by the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome* [n]. *Innocent* pretendeth in the Third place, every Point of Diſcipline and Eccleſiaſtical Polity to have been ſettled by the Apoſtles, and whatever was ſettled at *Rome* by St. *Peter* to have been there ſtrictly obſerved ever ſince his Time, without the leaſt Addition or Diminution. He concludes this Part of his Letter with laying it down as a general Maxim, That it is unlawful for any Biſhop to make the leaſt Alteration in the Diſcipline of his Church, or even to introduce into one Church a Cuſtom or Practice obſerved by another [o]. This nevertheleſs is what all Biſhops have done, and even thoſe of *Rome*, both before and after *Innocent*'s Time, and conſequently what they thought it lawful to do. The Pſalmody, for Inſtance (and innumerable other Inſtances might be alleged), or the ſinging of Pſalms in the Churches, was not inſtituted by any of the Apoſtles, but firſt introduced by St. *Ignatius* in the Church of *Antioch* [p], whence it ſpread in a very ſhort time to all the

All Churches ought, according to him, to conform to the Cuſtoms of the Roman *Church.*

Some Cuſtoms of the Roman *Church borrowed of other Churches.*

[n] Vid Petr. de Marc. diſſert, de primat p. 227. [o] Concil. t. 1. p. 1245, Ugh. t. 1. p. 676: [p] Socrat. l. ſt. c. 8.

the Churches in the East, those Bishops no more scrupling to adopt, than *Ignatius* had scrupled to introduce, so laudable a Practice. Of the Eastern Churches it was borrowed by the Church of *Milan*, and of the Church of *Milan* by that of *Rome*, long before *Innocent*'s Time; which plainly shews, that his Predecessors held not that Doctrine, no more than one of the best of his Successors, St. *Gregory the Great*, who openly approveth of some Customs, that were at first unknown to, but afterwards adopted by, his Church q. Upon the Whole, it is evident, that *Innocent* was grosly mistaken, not only with respect to this Point, but likewise in asserting, that whatever had been settled at *Rome* by St. *Peter*, was still observed there without the least *Addition* or *Diminution*.

The Ceremony of anointing those who are confirmed.

The remaining part of *Innocent*'s Letter relateth to some particular Ceremonies and Customs, especially to the Ceremony of confirming those who were baptized, and the Custom of fasting on *Saturdays*. With respect to the former, he informeth *Decentius*, that, according to the Custom of the Church, founded on the Practice of the Apostles, the Bishop alone can anoint on the Forehead those who have been baptized, and give them the Holy Ghost; and that the Priest can only anoint other Parts, the Episcopal Power not having been granted to them, although they partake of the Priesthood (A).

The

q Greg. l. 7. ep. 64.

(A) The Ceremony of anointing with Oil the Forehead, and likewise the Organs of the Five Senses, in those who had been baptized, is undoubtedly very antient. *Tertullian*, who lived in the Latter-end of the Second Century, speaketh of it as a Ceremony universally practised and established (1). St. *Cyprian* (2), who flourished Fifty Years after, St. *Ambrose* (3), St. *Austin* (4), St.

(1) Tert. de resur. carnis. (2) Cypr. ep. 72, 73. (3) Ambr. de sacram. l. 3. c. 2. (4) Aug contra Petil. l. 1. c. 104. de baptis. l. 3. c. 16. In ep. 1. Joan. tract. 3. & de diver. ser. 33.

The *Roman Catholics*, finding this Ceremony, now known by the Name of *Confirmation*, ſtyled a *Sacrament* Confirmation *not a Sacrament.*

St. *Jerom* (5), and the other Fathers, deſcribe it as a Ceremony, by which the Holy Ghoſt was given to thoſe who had been baptized, and conſequently which none but Biſhops could adminiſter, they being the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, to whom alone that Power was granted. For the Fathers, generally ſpeaking, and other antient Writers, ſuppoſe this and the Impoſition of Hands, by which the Holy Ghoſt was given by the Apoſtles to thoſe who were baptized (6), to be one and the ſame Ceremony. The Oil employed on this Occaſion was, as early as the Third Century, ſolemnly conſecrated, kept in the Churches or Places where the Faithful met, and held by them in great Veneration (7). This gave Riſe, in the following Century, to many ſuperſtitious Practices, and Miracles were ſaid to have been wrought by the *holy Oil*, to warrant ſuch Practices, and confound thoſe who thought it unlawful to comply with them. A very remarkable Miracle of this Nature is gravely related by *Optatus Milevitanus* (8), who wrote about the middle of the Fourth Century. But, in the Time of the Apoſtles, the Whole of this Ceremony conſiſted in the Impoſition of Hands: *Then laid they their Hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghoſt.* Not a Word of *Oil*, of *Chriſm*, of *Unction*, of *ſigning with Oil on the Forehead* in the Form of a *Croſs*, and much leſs of a *Blow* given by the Biſhop on the Cheek to the Perſon that is confirmed, although theſe are now all deemed, in the Church of *Rome*, eſſential Parts of this Ceremony. As ſuch Rites were unknown to, and unpractiſed by, the Apoſtles, it mattereth little how early they were introduced after their Time. And here I cannot help obſerving, that the *Roman Catholics* themſelves have not thought fit to adopt all the Ceremonies uſed on this Occaſion, and recommended by the Fathers. For, in *Innocent*'s Time, the Perſon confirmed was not only anointed on the Forehead, but on other Parts; on the Forehead by the Biſhop, on other Parts by the Prieſts. The other Parts were, as we gather from *Cyril* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* (9), the Eyes, Ears, Noſe, Mouth, Hands and Feet. The anointing of theſe Parts was, in the Opinion of that Father, no leſs fraught with Myſteries than the anointing of the Forehead: and yet the former Unction, notwithſtanding its Antiquity, and all the Myſteries it ſymbolized, hath been long ſince omitted, as altogether unneceſſary. They might in like manner have omitted all the reſt, and contented themſelves, as the Apoſtles did, with the bare Impoſition of Hands.

(5) Hier. contra Luciferian. (6) Act. viii. 15---17. (7) Cyp. ep. 70. & de oper. card. & unct. Chriſ. (8) Optat. Milev. con. tra Parm. l. 2. (9) Cyril. Catech. myſtag. 3.

ment by St. *Cyprian* [r], and St. *Auſtin* [s], have thereupon raiſed it to that Rank, not reflecting that the antient Writers make frequently uſe of that Word to expreſs no more than a *ſacred Ceremony*, or Myſtery. And truly were they to reckon among their *Sacraments* all the Ceremonies which the Fathers and other Chriſtian Writers have diſtinguiſhed with that Title, their Number would amount to Seventy rather than to Seven.

Why deemed formerly unlawful to faſt on Sunday *or* Saturday.

With reſpect to the other Point, thoſe who are ever ſo little verſed in the Writings of the Fathers, muſt know, that, from the earlieſt Times, it was deemed unlawful, nay, and highly criminal, for a Chriſtian to faſt on *Sunday* or *Saturday*; on *Sunday*, becauſe thoſe Heretics, who denied the Reſurrection of our Saviour, faſted on that Day, in Oppoſition to the Orthodox, who, believing it, ſolemnized the *Sunday*, the Day on which it happened, with Feaſting and Rejoicings; on *Saturday*, becauſe other Heretics holding the God of the *Jews*, and the Author of their Law, to be an evil Spirit, whom Chriſt came to deſtroy, faſted on the Seventh Day, thinking that by faſting they vilified the God of the *Jews* as much as the *Jews* honoured him by faſting [t]. On this Head St. *Ignatius*, who had converſed with the Apoſtles, expreſſeth himſelf in the ſtrongeſt Terms: *If any one*, ſaith he, *faſteth on* Sundays *or* Saturdays, *he therefore becometh guilty of the Death of Chriſt* (*Chriſti interfector eſt* [u]). Among the antient Canons, known by the Name of the *Apoſtolic Conſtitutions*, we read the following Ordinance: *If a Clerk ſhall be found to have faſted on a* Sunday *or a* Saturday, *let him be depoſed*; *if a Layman, let him be cut off from the Communion of the Faithful* [x]. But *Ignatius*, and the other *Greek* Fathers, who, after his Time, condemned that Practice of faſting on *Saturdays*, muſt be

[r] Cypr. ep. 72. [s] Aug. de diver. ſerm. 33. [t] Vide Iren. l. 1. c. 21---24. & Epiph. hæreſ. 2 ---28. & 41, 42. [u] Ign. ep. 8. ad Philippenſes. [x] Apoſt. conſt. can. 55.

be underſtood only with reſpect to the Eaſt; for there was broached, and there chiefly prevailed, the Hereſy that firſt introduced ſuch a Practice. But in the Weſt, where that Hereſy was ſcarce known, ſome Churches, and the *Roman* in particular obſerved both *Fridays* and *Saturdays* as Faſt-days. The *Friday* was, from the earlieſt Times, a Faſt-day with all Churches, both in the Eaſt and the Weſt; the *Saturday* was only in the Weſt, and even there with very few Churches, which had borrowed that Cuſtom of the *Roman* Church, as we are informed by St. *Auſtin*[x]. *Innocent* therefore, deſirous of eſtabliſhing in all other Chuches the Cuſtom that obtained in his own, undertaketh to prove, firſt, That all may, and, ſecondly, That all ought to obſerve *Saturday* as a Faſt. That all may, he proveth well enough; but the Reaſons he offereth to ſhew that all ought, *viz. Becauſe Chriſt lay in the Sepulchre the* Saturday *as well as the* Friday, *and the Apoſtles faſted*, as he ſuppoſeth, *both Days*, are manifeſtly unconcluſive as to any Obligation. Beſides, it was not becauſe Chriſt lay in the Sepulchre, or becauſe the Apoſtles faſted, but becauſe Chriſt was crucified on a *Friday*, that a Faſt was appointed to be obſerved on that Day. In Proceſs of Time, the Cuſtom of ſanctifying both Days with a Faſt took place in moſt of the Weſtern Churches; and this Cuſtom hath been made in latter times a general Law, and one of the Commandments of the Church which all *Roman Catholics* are bound to obey on pain of Damnation. However, the Severity of it is ſo far relaxed, that, as they are only required to abſtain from Meat, the utmoſt Riot and Epicuriſm in other Kinds of Food, and in Wine, may be, and are, indulged on their Faſt-days.

Friday *from the earlieſt Times a Faſt-day.*

Saturday *a Faſt-day in the* Roman *Church.*

The laſt Article of *Innocent*'s Letter relateth to the Ceremony of anointing the Sick with Oil, agreeably to that of St. *James*, *Is any ſick among you*, &c. y? As the Apoſtle directs the Faithful to *call for the*

The Ceremony of anointing the Sick with Oil.

x Aug. ep. 86 y James v. 14, 15.

Elders of the Church; some took from thence Occasion to question whether Bishops were impowered to perform that Ceremony. *Innocent* therefore answereth *Decentius*, who had proposed the Question, that there can be no room to doubt whether or no the Bishops have such a Power, since the Priests can have none, which the Bishops have not, of whom they receive all their Power. It is true, saith *Innocent*, that St. *James* ordered the Faithful to call for the Elders, and not for the Bishops; but that was because he knew that the Bishops could not have so much Leisure from other important Duties as the Priests. He adds, that this Unction must not be applied to Penitents; that the Oil used in it must be blessed by the Bishop; and when it is thus blessed, not the Presbyters only, but all the Faithful, may anoint with it both themselves and others. The Power of anointing St. *James* confined to the Elders or Priests, and that is the present Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, although *Innocent* extended such a Power to all the Faithful. This Ceremony, now known by the Name of *Extreme Unction*, was, in *Innocent*'s Time, *a kind of Sacrament*; for so he styleth it [z]. But it is now a true *Sacrament*, and such it was declared by the Council of *Trent*. [a].

Letters from the Councils of Carthage *and* Milevum *to* Innocent.

In the Year 416, *Innocent* received Three Letters from the *African* Bishops; *viz.* one from the Bishops of *Africa*, properly so called, assembled at *Carthage*; another from those of *Numidia*, assembled at *Milevum*; and a Third from St. *Austin*, signed by him and Four other Bishops. The two Councils wrote to acquaint *Innocent*, that they had condemned *Pelagius* and his Disciple *Cælestius*, of whose Opinions I shall speak hereafter, and desire him to add the Authority of the Apostolic See to their Decrees. The Letter from St. *Austin*, and the Four other Bishops, was to inform *Innocent*, in a friendly manner, that he was suspected of countenancing those Heretics, and favouring

[z] Concil. t. 2. p. 1248. [a] Conc. Trid. sess. 14, can. 1.

vouring their Doctrine. This Suſpicion they themſelves ſeem not to have thought quite groundleſs: for *Poſſidius*, one of the Biſhops who ſubſcribed the Letter, writes, that the *African* Biſhops took a great deal of Pains to convince *Innocent*, and his Succeſſor *Zoſimus*, that the Doctrine of *Pelagius* was erroneous and heretical, knowing that his Followers were ſtriving to infect the Apoſtolic See itſelf with their poiſonous Tenets [b]. They ſtrove in vain, ſaith *Baronius*; and perhaps they did; but the *African* Biſhops had never taken ſo much Pains to guard the Apoſtolic See againſt that Infection, had they not thought it capable of being infected. The Five Biſhops ſent to *Innocent*, together with their Letter, St. *Auſtin*'s Anſwer to a Letter which he had received from *Pelagius*; his Confutation of a Book compoſed by that Heretic and the Book itſelf, with the Paſſages marked in it that gave moſt Offence, and claimed a particular Attention, leſt he ſhould overlook them [c], This was not treating him as an infallible Judge (A).

Innocent's *Anſwer to the Councils.*

The Letters from the Council of *Carthage*, from that of *Milevum*, and from the Five Biſhops, were brought to *Rome* by *Julius*, Biſhop of ſome City in *Afric*; and, by the ſame *Julius*, *Innocent* anſwered them with Three Letters, all dated the 27th of *January* of the Year 417. The Firſt, which is addreſſed to

[b] Poſſid. Aug. vit. c. 18. [c] Aug. ep. 95.

(A) *Baronius* obſerveth here, that their informing him by a private Letter, and not by a public one from the Council, of the Suſpicions that ſome entertained of him, was a Mark of the great Reſpect and Veneration they had for the Biſhop of *Rome*, whoſe Nakedneſs they were unwilling, as it became dutiful Children, to expoſe to the Eyes of the World (1). And who told *Baronius*, that, in the like Circumſtances, they would not have ſhewn the ſame Reſpect for any other Biſhop? He had better have obſerved, and the Obſervation is more obvious, that his being ſuſpected at all evidently proves the *Infallibility* of the Apoſtolic See not to have been, in thoſe Days, an Article of the Catholic Faith.

(1) Bar. ad ann. 416. n. 11.

to *Aurelius*, probably Bishop of *Carthage*, and to the other Bishops of that Assembly, he beginneth with commending them for their Zeal, their Pastoral Vigilance, and the Regard they had shewn for the *Apostolic See*. He hence taketh an Opportunity to resume his usual and favourite Subject, the Dignity, Pre-eminence, and Authority of that See; roundly asserting, that *all Ecclesiastical Matters throughout the World are, by Divine Right, to be referred to the Apostolic See, before they are finally decided in the Province.* This was indeed a very bold Claim, and a direct asserting to himself the Universal Supremacy attained by his Successors. But it was yet too early for such a Claim to be granted; and it is plain the *African* Bishops had no Idea of this Divine Right. For, had they entertained any such Notion, they surely would never have presumed finally to condemn and anathematize, as they did, *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, without consulting at least the Apostolic See: neither would they have wrote to *Innocent* in the Style they did, after they had condemned them: for in their Letter, they do not leave him at Liberty to approve or disapprove of what they had done; but only desire him to join his Authority to theirs, which they well knew he could not refuse to do, without confirming the Suspicion of his countenancing the *Pelagians*, and their Doctrine. *We have anathematized* Pelagius *and* Cælestius, say the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage*, *and thought fit to acquaint you with it, that to the Decrees of our Mediocrity might be added the Authority of the Apostolic See.* This is a modest Style, and respectful to the See of *Rome*; but it is that of Men who plainly thought they had a Right to act in this Matter, by their own Judgement and Power, without waiting for the Award of that See, as they ought to have done, if they had allowed of *Innocent*'s Claim. In like manner the Council of *Milevum*, after informing *Innocent* of the Sentence, which they had pronounced against the

He claims the first a Divine Right of finally deciding all Controversies.

Which is not ackowleged by the African *nor the* Numidian *Bishops.*

Two

Two above-mentioned Heretics, added: *And this Error and Impiety, which hath every-where ſo many Followers and Abetters, ought alſo to be anathematized and condemned by the Apoſtolic See* [h]; which was putting *Innocent* in mind of what he ought to do, and not conſulting him what they ſhould do. This Conduct of the *African* Biſhops gave *Innocent* no ſmall Uneaſineſs. He was at a Loſs what to do at ſo critical a Juncture. For to approve of a Conduct, ſo derogatory to the pretended Dignity of his See, was giving up his Claim to the *Divine Right* of finally deciding all Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies. To diſapprove it, was confirming the Suſpicion of his countenancing the Doctrine which they had condemned. But *Innocent* was a Man of great Subtlety and Addreſs; and he found out, at laſt, an Expedient to extricate himſelf out of that Perplexity, and gratify the Fathers of both Councils, without either approveing or condemning their paſt Conduct. The only thing they required of him was to join his Authority with theirs, in condemning the *Pelagian* Hereſy; and that he readily did. But, leſt in ſo doing, he ſhould ſeem to approve of their having condemned it without firſt conſulting him, in his Anſwer to their Letters, he ſuppoſes them to have actually conſulted him; nay, to have referred to him the final Deciſion of that Controverſy; and, agreeably to that Suppoſition, he commends them for the Deference they had thereby ſhewn to the Apoſtolic See. *You have well obſerved*, ſaith he, *the Ordinances of the antient Fathers, and not trampled under-foot what they, not in human Wiſdom, but by Divine Order, have eſtabliſhed*; viz. *That whatever is done in Places, however remote, ſhould, for a final Concluſion, be referred to the Apoſtolic See.* And again, *You have had due Regard to the Honour of the Apoſtolic See, I mean of him who has the Charge and Care of all Churches, in conſulting him in theſe Perplexities, and intricate Caſes* [i]. Thus did

An Inſtance of Innocent's *great Subtlety and Addreſs.*

[h] Aug. ep. 90---95. [i] Idem ib.

did *Innocent* maintain his Claim, and at the same time, avoid quarreling, at an improper Season, with those who had acted in direct Opposition to it. A necessary Policy in the first setting up of such extravagant and groundless Pretensions.

He excommunicates Cælestius *and* Pelagius.

In the present Letter he not only approveth of the Judgment given against *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* by the *African* Bishops, but allegeth several Reasons in Confutation of the Doctrines they taught; and concludeth, by declaring them cut off from the Communion of the Church, agreeably to the Sentence of the *African* Bishops, as Men not only unworthy of that Communion, but of human Society, and even of Life [k]. The same things he repeateth in his Answer to the Bishops of *Numidia*; but he seems there to have been sensible, upon a more cool Consideration, that, in his Letter to the Council of *Carthage*, he had strained his Prerogative too high; and therefore in this he confineth to Matters of *Faith* the general Maxim, which he had laid down, concerning the Obligation of referring all Ecclesiastical Matters, for a final Decision, to the Apostolic See. In the same Letter he endeavoureth to confute, in particular, the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, allowing Children, who die without Baptism, to partake of eternal Life [l]. In his Answer to the Five Bishops, he refers them for his real Sentiments, concerning the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, to the other Two Letters, adding, that he had read the Book of *Pelagius*, which they had sent him, and found nothing in it that he liked, or rather that he did not dislike [m] (A).

Cælestius

[k] Aug. ep. 93. [l] Idem ep. 91, 33. [m] Idem ep. 96.

(A) That the *Pelagian* Heresy was first condemned by the *African* Bishops, is a Fact so well attested, that one would think it impossible it should ever have come into any Man's Thoughts to call it in question. And yet *Baronius*, upon the Authority of a very doubtful Passage out of St. *Prosper*, a cotemporary Writer, roundly asserts that Heresy to have been first condemned, not by the

Cæleſtius had been condemned by a Council held at *Carthage* in the Year 412, and probably conſiſting of the ſame Biſhops who compoſed that of the Year 416. From their Sentence he appealed, as *Baronius* obſerveth [n], to the See of *Rome*, ſummoning his Accuſer *Paulinus* to appear at the ſame Tribunal. But all we can infer from thence is, that either *Innocent* did not receive the Appeal, or, if he did, that the *African* Biſhops made no Account of it, ſince they condemned him anew, without waiting for the Judgment of *Innocent*, to whom he had appealed.

Cæleſtius *condemned by the* African *Biſhops, notwithſtanding his Appeal to* Rome.

Innocent wrote Two Letters more, a little before his Death, one of which was to St. *Jerom*, comforting him in his Diſtreſs. For ſome, who favoured *Pelagius*, provoked at *Jerom*'s repeated Invectives againſt him, had ſet Fire to his Monaſtery at *Bethlehem*, and burnt it down to the Ground, agreeably to the Spirit and Methods in which religious Controverſies are now carried on. Their Deſign was to have burnt *Jerom* himſelf; but he had the good Luck to eſcape out of the Flames, and ſave himſelf in a ſtrong Tower. The Two noble Virgins, *Euſtochium* and her Niece *Paula*, who led a retired Life under the Direction of *Jerom*, met with no better Treatment. For thoſe Fanatics, breaking into the Houſe where they lived, beat ſome of their Attendants in their Preſence, killed others, and threatened them with Fire and Deſtruction. With this they acquainted *Innocent*, who thereupon wrote to *Jerom*, offering to exert *the whole Authority of the Apoſtolic See* againſt the Authors of ſuch Succeſſes, provided he knew who they

Innocent's *Letter to* Jerom.

[n] Bar, ad ann. 412, n. 25.

the *African* Biſhops, but by *Innocent* (1). The Words of *Proſper* are: --- *Peſtem ſubeuntem prima recidit ſedes Roma Petri* (2). Theſe Words are variouſly interpreted by the Learned, but all agree in rejecting the Interpretation of *Baronius*, as making (3) *Proſper* contradict a known Truth.

(1) Bar ad ann. 412. n. 26. (2) Proſp. de Ingratis, l. 1. c. 2. (3) Vide Janſenium de Hær. Pelag. p. 16. Merc. t. p. 9.

they were: for the Two Virgins had concealed their Names, probably to prevent his exerting that Authority, which they had Reason to apprehend would be attended with greater Evils. *Innocent* adds, that so long as the Authors and Promoters of those unheard of Barbarities are unknown, he can only condole with those who have suffered by them; but, if they were accused in due Form, at his Tribunal, he would not fail to appoint proper Judges to try them; which, by the way, he had no Right to do.

His Letter to John *of* Jerusalem.

Innocent's other Letter is to *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who hated *Jerom*, on Account of his Inveteracy against *Origen*, who was suspected to connive at the cruel Treatment he and his Followers had met with. Him therefore *Innocent* reprimandeth very severely, for suffering such enormous Abuses within the Limits of his Jurisdiction. In his Letter he giveth him the Title of *well-beloved Brother*; but, at the same time, treateth him with more Haughtiness than was becoming even in a Superior, although he neither had, nor could claim by the Canons, any kind of Jurisdiction or Authority over him.

Innocent *dies.*

These Letters *Innocent* wrote in the Latter-end of *January*, and died on the 12th of *March* of the same Year 417, having governed the *Roman* Church near Fifteen Years; for his Predecessor *Anastasius* died on the 27th of *April* 402, and he was chosen soon after his Decease, as I have observed above. He was generally esteemed a Man of good Parts, and well acquainted with the Laws and Traditions of the Church. Hence he was frequently consulted by the Western, sometimes by the Eastern Bishops, in Points both of Faith and Discipline. Of this general Esteem, and the Deference that was thereupon paid to his Decisions, he took Advantage to lay down, with an Air of Authority, and as undoubted Truths, many false, groundless, and dangerous Maxims, all tending to the Diminution of the Episcopal Power, and the Advancement of the Papal. *The Dignity of the Apostlic*

The See of Rome *greatly indebted to him for its Grandeur.*

See

See was, as we have ſeen, the Burden of almoſt all his Letters; he even improved it into a Claim of Supremacy; and we may ſay, with great Truth, that to him the See of *Rome* was more indebted for the Grandeur it afterwards gained, than to all his Predeceſſors together. He formed the Plan of that Spiritual Monarchy, which they, by conſtant Application, eſtabliſhed at laſt, in ſpite of the many almoſt inſurmountable Difficulties, which they had to contend with. He was the firſt, who, changing the antient Foundation of the Primacy, claimed it as the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, *the Prince of the Apoſtles*, as he is ſtyled, and not as the Biſhop of the firſt City, although on that Conſideration alone it had been granted by the Councils. I ſaid *Primacy*, becauſe the Word *Supremacy* was utterly unknown in thoſe Days. The Council of *Sardica*, held in the Year 347, had allowed, in ſome Caſes, and under ſeveral Reſtrictions, Appeals to be made to the See of *Rome*, as hath been obſerved elſewhere[t]. But *Innocent*, ſcorning to owe any Branch of his Authority to that, or any other Council, claimed, by *Divine Right*, the Power of finally deciding all Eccleſiaſtical Controverſies and Diſputes; which was claiming, by Divine Right, an unlimited Juriſdiction. It is true, no Regard was had to ſuch Claims; nor indeed did *Innocent* dare to purſue them, being well appriſed of the Oppoſition he would meet with, if he ſhould then have made ſuch an Attempt. He therefore wiſely contented himſelf with laying Foundations, and thought it a great Advance, as it certainly was, to have openly aſſerted ſuch Notions, and brought the Ears of Men to endure them, if not their Minds. Had he gone farther, he would have been ſtopped in his Career, and it might have proved fatal to the Power of *Rome* before it was come to an Age of Maturity; but that he went thus far was of great Benefit to it, becauſe it made a Beginning, and furniſhed

[t] Vid p. 161.

nished his Successors with a Pretence to plead some Antiquity for the Opinions and Principles upon which they proceeded.

His Decretals often quoted by the Popish Divines. Accordingly the Decretals of *Innocent* are frequently quoted by the Advocates for the See of *Rome*, to shew how early the Popes claimed, by Divine Right, and as Successors of St. *Peter*, an universal Authority and Jurisdiction. But if the Principals, on which they founded their Claims, were false in *Innocent*'s Time, they are still so in ours; if no Account was then made of such Claims (and that none was made, I have sufficiently shewn), no Account ought to be made of them now; no more than if they were dated but Yesterday. Nor, indeed, ought the Beginning of the Fifth Century to be esteemed an early Time in the Christian Church. Great Corruptions were then crept into it; and, with regard to the Point in Question, it was very late. For had the Bishop of *Rome* been supreme Head of the Church, in Right of St. *Peter*, how came that Supremacy to be unknown, and unheard of, for above Four hundred Years? If the Four first Ceuturies could not discover it, on what new Light was it revealed to the Fifth?

He is sainted, *Innocent* hath been inrolled, by his Successors, in the Catalogue of Saints; and he is now adored in the Church of *Rome* as a Saint of the first Rate; an Honour which, it must be confessed, he better deserved at their Hands, in their Estimation of Merit, than any of his Predecessors, or any of his Successors, except *Gregory* the VIIth.

ZOSIMUS,

HONORIUS, **ZOSIMUS,** THEODOSIUS *the younger.*

Fortieth BISHOP *of* Rome.

ZOSIMUS, the Succeſſor of *Innocent*, was, according to the *Bibliothecarian*, a *Greek* by Nation, and the Son of one *Abraham* [a]; which is all we know of him before his Election. He was elected and ordained Six Days after the Death of his Predeceſſor, that is, on the 18th of *March* 417 (A). Year of Chriſt 417.

The firſt thing that engaged the Attention of *Zoſimus*, after his Election, was the Hereſy of *Pelagius*, and his chief Diſciple *Cæleſtius*, which, at that time, made a great Noiſe in the Church. *Pelagius* was by Birth a *Briton*, and a Monk by Profeſſion; but one of thoſe who, parting with their Eſtates, and renouncing all worldly Honours, lived an auſtere Life; but in no Community, and under no Rule. Such a Monk was the famous *Paulinus*, ſuch *Pammachius*, and ſuch probably *Pelagius*; for I do not find, in any antient Writer, that he ever confined himſelf to a Pelagius *his Country, Profeſſion, Parts, &c.*

[a] Anaſ. c. 42.

(A) *Paſcaſinus*, Biſhop of *Lilybæum*, obſerveth, at the Year 443, that in 417, when *Zoſimus* was Biſhop of *Rome*, *Eaſter*, which ought to have been kept on the 22d of *April*, was, by a Miſtake, kept on the 25th of *March* (1); ſo that on the 25th of *March*, *Zoſimus* was in Poſſeſſion of the See; and conſequently muſt have been choſen and ordained on the 18th of that Month, the only *Sunday* in 417, between the 12th of *March*, when *Innocent* died, and the 25th. For in thoſe Days Biſhops were commonly ordained on *Sundays*, and it is very certain, that *Zoſimus* was ordained on that Day, ſince he pretended the Ordination of Two Biſhops, whom he depoſed, to be null, becauſe they had been ordained on another Day (2).

Theodoret maketh *Boniface* the immediate Succeſſor of *Innocent* (3). But all the other Writers, without Exception, place *Zoſimus* between *Innocent* and *Boniface*.

(1) Leo, t. 1. p. 413. (2) Conc. t. 2. p. 1569. (3) Theod. l. 5. p. 751.

a Monaſtery; nay, the wandering Life he led is a ſtrong Proof he never did (B). As to his Parts, *Jerom*, who could never diſcover any thing commendable in thoſe he oppoſed, ſpeaketh of him with the greateſt Contempt, as if he had no Genius, and but very little Knowlege [c]. But. St. *Auſtin*, a more candid and leſs paſſionate Writer, owneth him to have been a Man of extraordinary good Senſe, of a very ſprightly Genius, of great Penetration, and one who was not eaſily overcome, but rather capable of maintaining, with the ſtrongeſt Reaſons that could be offered, the Opinions which he once embraced [d]. He lived ſeveral Years at *Rome*, at leaſt from the Year 400, to 411, and was there well known, and greatly eſteemed. For St. *Auſtin*, who firſt heard of him, while he lived at *Rome*, ſpoke of him in the firſt Books, which he wrote againſt him, as of a Man, *who paſſed for a Saint, who had made great Progreſs in Piety, whoſe Life was chaſte, and Manners blameleſs, who had ſold and given to the Poor all he had*, &c [e]. St. *Paulinus* and St. *Jerom* ſeem to have once entertained a no leſs favourable Opinion of him in theſe Reſpects, than St. *Auſtin* did; for they too, in ſome of their Letters, ſpeak of him with the greateſt Commendations. But he no ſooner began to broach his new Doctrines than he forfeited their good Opinion, and with it every Virtue which he had formerly poſſeſſed; nay, they pretend that he abandoned himſelf, at once, to immoderate Eating and Drinking, and to all manner of Debauchery, paſſing his whole Time in Revels and Banquets, in careſſing and pampering his Body, which by that means, ſaith *Jerom*, ſwelled to ſuch an exorbitant Size, that he

[c] Janſ. Hiſt. Pel. p. 2. [d] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. [e] Aug. ep. 95. Pecc. Orig. c. 8---21, &c.

(B) He is commonly ſtyled *Pelagius the Briton*, to diſtinguiſh him from *Pelagius* of *Tarento*, who lived about the ſame time (4).

(4) Aug. ep. 106. Proſp. contra Ingrat. l. 1. c. 1.

he was more capable of cruſhing his Adverſaries with the Weight of his Carcaſe than the Weight of his Arguments [f]. We ſhall find very few, if any at all, who, upon their teaching Doctrines not approved by the Fathers, have not been immediately transformed by them, out of their great Zeal for the Purity of the Faith, into Monſters of Wickedneſs, although they themſelves had, perhaps, propoſed them before for Patterns of every Chriſtian Virtue. It behoveth us therefore to be very cautious in giving Credit to what they ſay of thoſe whom they ſtyle Heretics. With reſpect to *Pelagius*, St. *Auſtin*, more moderate than the reſt, doth not charge him with any Vices, but only aſcribeth to Hypocriſy the Virtues which he had admired in him before [g].

Cæleſtius, the firſt and chief Diſciple of *Pelagius*, was, according to ſome, a Native of *Scotland* or *Ireland*; according to others, of *Campania* in *Italy* [h]; but, with reſpect to his Country, nothing certain can be advanced. He was deſcended of an illuſtrious Family, and had applied himſelf, from his Youth, to the Study of the Law, and made ſome Figure at the Bar; but growing weary of that Profeſſion, he retired from the World, embraced a monaſtic Life, and lived ſome Years in a Monaſtery [i]. St. *Jerom* ſpeaketh of him as a Man of no Genius or Talents [k]. But St. *Auſtin* entertained a very different Opinion of his Parts; for he commendeth him as a good Writer, as one who was thoroughly acquainted with all the Subtilties of Logic, and whoſe Talents would have proved very ſerviceable, could he have been retrieved from his Errors [l]. *Cæleſtius his Family, Profeſſion, Parts, &c.*

The Tenets of *Pelagius* or *Cæleſtius* (for thoſe, who embraced them, are ſtyled indifferently *Pelagians* and *Cæleſtians*) may be reduced to the following Heads: *Their Doctrine.*

[f] Hier. in Jer. [g] Vide Jan. hiſt. Pel. l. 6. c. 24. [h] Hier. in Jer. et Garnerius in Mar. Mercat. [i] Gennad. de ſcript. eccleſ. c. 44. [k] Hier. ad Cteſiph. c. 3. [l] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.

Heads: 1. That we may, by our Free-will, without the Help of Grace, do Good, and avoid Evil. 2. That if Grace were necessary for either, God would be unjust in giving it to one, and denying it to another. 3. That Faith, which is the first Step to our Justification, dependeth upon our Free-will. 4. That the Sin of *Adam* hurt none but him; that Children are born in the State which he was in before the Fall; that they are not delivered by Baptism from eternal Perdition, but, without Baptism, partake of Life everlasting. By Life everlasting they meant, a middle State between eternal Happiness and eternal Misery. 5. That Grace is only necessary to render the Observance of the Commandments more easy.

Both pass over into Africa.

These Opinions *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* first broached at *Rome*, about the Year 405, and gained there a great many Followers; more, saith St. *Austin*, than could be well imagined [m]. They both left *Rome* in 410, or 411, and, crossing over into *Africa*, infected many there, says the same Author, especially at *Carthage*, with their new Doctrine [n]. *Pelagius*, after a short Stay at *Carthage*, went first into *Egypt*, and from thence into *Palæstine*, where he continued a long time [o]. *Cælestius* remained at *Carthage*, hoping to be preferred there to the Priesthood; but as he did not use the due Caution in propagating his Doctrine in that City, he was soon discovered, and accused by one *Paulinus*, a Deacon, before a Council, at which several Bishops were present, and *Aurelius* of *Carthage* presided. The Charge brought against him was, That he held the Sin of *Adam* to have hurt him alone; that it could not be imputed to his Descendents; and that no Sin was cancelled by Baptism. These Tenets he did not own before the Council; but neither would he disown or anathematize them: and therefore the Bishops, provoked at his Obstinacy, not only condemned his Doctrine, but,

Pelagius *repairs to* Palæstine.

Cælestius *accused and condemned in* Africa.

[m] Aug. ep. 89. [n] Aug. de Gest. Pelag. c. 22. [o] Aug. ibid.

but, at the same time, cut him off, as an incorrigible Heretic from the Communion of the Church [o]. From this Sentence *Cælestius* appealed to the Judgement of *Innocent*, then Bishop of *Rome*, summoning *Paulinus*, his Accuser, to make his Charge good at that Tribunal. But *Cælestius* himself laid, it seemeth, no Stress on his Appeal; for, instead of repairing to *Rome*, he fled to *Ephesus* [p], where we shall leave him for the present.

Appeals to Rome, *but flies to* Ephesus.

Pelagius, in the mean time, was not idle in *Palæstine*, whither he had retired, as I have said above; but, being countenanced by *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, he gained daily such Numbers of Followers there, that *Heros* and *Lazarus*, Two Bishops of *Gaul*, whom I shall speak of hereafter, happening to be then in *Palæstine*, thought it incumbent upon them to accuse him to *Eulogius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and Metropolitan of *Palæstine*. They drew up a Writeing accordingly, containing the chief Heads of the Doctrine which *Pelagius* taught, together with the Articles, for which his Disciple *Cælestius* had been condemned by the Council of *Carthage*; and this Writing they presented to *Eulogius*. Hereupon a Council was assembled soon after at *Diospolis*, a City of *Palæstine*, known in Scripture by the Name of *Lydda*. It consisted of Fourteen Bishops, and *Eulogius* of *Cæsarea* presided; but neither of the *Gallican* Bishops was present, the one being prevented by a dangerous Malady, and the other not chusing to abandon him in that Condition. However, their Charge against *Pelagius* was read, and he examined, by the Fathers of the Assembly, on the Articles it contained. But as nobody appeared against him, as none of those Bishops were sufficiently acquainted with the *Latin* Tongue to understand his Books, and he disowned some Propositions, explained others in a

Pelagius *accused in* Palæstine *by* Heros *and* Lazarus, *two* Gallican *Bishops*;

and absolved by the Council of Diospolis.

[o] Aug. ep. 89. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. [p] Aug. ib. et de Gest. Pel. c. 11. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. Oros. apol. p. 801.

Heads: 1. That we may, by our Free-will, without the Help of Grace, do Good, and avoid Evil. 2. That if Grace were necessary for either, God would be unjust in giving it to one, and denying it to another. 3. That Faith, which is the first Step to our Justification, dependeth upon our Free-will. 4. That the Sin of *Adam* hurt none but him; that Children are born in the State which he was in before the Fall; that they are not delivered by Baptism from eternal Perdition, but, without Baptism, partake of Life everlasting. By Life everlasting they meant, a middle State between eternal Happiness and eternal Misery. 5. That Grace is only necessary to render the Observance of the Commandments more easy.

Both pass over into Africa.

These Opinions *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* first broached at *Rome*, about the Year 405, and gained there a great many Followers; more, saith St. *Austin*, than could be well imagined [m]. They both left *Rome* in 410, or 411, and, crossing over into *Africa*, infected many there, says the same Author, especially at *Carthage*, with their new Doctrine [n]. *Pelagius*, after a short Stay at *Carthage*, went first into *Egypt*, and from thence into *Palæstine*, where he continued a long time [o]. *Cælestius* remained at *Carthage*, hoping to be preferred there to the Priesthood; but as he did not use the due Caution in propagating his Doctrine in that City, he was soon discovered, and accused by one *Paulinus*, a Deacon, before a Council, at which several Bishops were present, and *Aurelius* of *Carthage* presided. The Charge brought against him was, That he held the Sin of *Adam* to have hurt him alone; that it could not be imputed to his Descendents; and that no Sin was cancelled by Baptism. These Tenets he did not own before the Council; but neither would he disown or anathematize them: and therefore the Bishops, provoked at his Obstinacy, not only condemned his Doctrine, but,

Pelagius *repairs to* Palæstine.

Cælestius *accused and condemned in* Africa.

[m] Aug. ep. 89. [n] Aug. de Gest. Pelag. c. 22. [o] Aug. ibid.

but, at the same time, cut him off, as an incorrigible Heretic from the Communion of the Church [o]. From this Sentence *Cælestius* appealed to the Judgement of *Innocent*, then Bishop of *Rome*, summoning *Paulinus*, his Accuser, to make his Charge good at that Tribunal. But *Cælestius* himself laid, it seemeth, no Stress on his Appeal; for, instead of repairing to *Rome*, he fled to *Ephesus* [p], where we shall leave him for the present.

Appeals to Rome, *but flies to* Ephesus.

Pelagius, in the mean time, was not idle in *Palæstine*, whither he had retired, as I have said above; but, being countenanced by *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, he gained daily such Numbers of Followers there, that *Heros* and *Lazarus*, Two Bishops of *Gaul*, whom I shall speak of hereafter, happening to be then in *Palæstine*, thought it incumbent upon them to accuse him to *Eulogius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and Metropolitan of *Palæstine*. They drew up a Writeing accordingly, containing the chief Heads of the Doctrine which *Pelagius* taught, together with the Articles, for which his Disciple *Cælestius* had been condemned by the Council of *Carthage*; and this Writing they presented to *Eulogius*. Hereupon a Council was assembled soon after at *Diospolis*, a City of *Palæstine*, known in Scripture by the Name of *Lydda*. It consisted of Fourteen Bishops, and *Eulogius* of *Cæsarea* presided; but neither of the *Gallican* Bishops was present, the one being prevented by a dangerous Malady, and the other not chusing to abandon him in that Condition. However, their Charge against *Pelagius* was read, and he examined, by the Fathers of the Assembly, on the Articles it contained. But as nobody appeared against him, as none of those Bishops were sufficiently acquainted with the *Latin* Tongue to understand his Books, and he disowned some Propositions, explained others in a

Pelagius *accused in* Palæstine *by* Heros *and* Lazarus, *two* Gallican *Bishops*;

and absolved by the Council of Diospolis.

[o] Aug. ep. 89. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. [p] Aug. ib. et de Gest. Pel. c. 11. Mar. Mer. comm. c. 1. Oros. apol. p. 801.

a Catholic Sense, and anathematized all who maintained Doctrines repugnant to those of the Catholic Church, the Council pronounced, at the Suggestion of *John* of *Jerusalem*, the following Sentence: *Since the Monk* Pelagius, *here present, hath satisfied us, as to his Doctrine, and anathematized, with us, whatever is contrary to the true Faith, we acknowlege him to be in the Communion of the Church* [q]. This Council St. *Jerom* styles, *The Pitiful Synod of* Diospolis [r]. But St. *Austin*, instead of insulting them, calls them *Holy and Catholic Judges*; and will not answer, that he himself might not have been deceived by the Artifices of *Pelagius*, had he been one of his Judges [s].

He is accused by Heros *and* Lazarus *to the Bishops of* Africa.

Heros and *Lazarus*, surprised to hear that the Fathers of the Assembly had absolved *Pelagius*, and despairing of ever being able to get him condemned in the East, where his Cause was openly espoused by the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, resolved to apply to their Brethren in the West, especially to the Bishops of *Africa*, who they well knew could not be prejudiced in his Favour, since they had already condemned his favourite Disciple *Cælestius*. Pursuant to this Resolution, they wrote, by the famous *Orosius*, who was returning from *Palæstine* to *Africa*, to the Bishops of that Province, accusing *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* as the Authors of an *Execrable Sect*; giving them a particular Account of what had passed in the Council of *Diospolis*, and acquainting them with the wonderful Progress the new Heresy made in the East, especially in *Palæstine* [t].

The Doctrine of Pelagius *and* Cælestius *condemned anew in* Africa.

These Letters were delivered by *Orosius* to the Bishops of the Province of *Carthage*, who, after having caused them to be read in the Provincial Council, which was then sitting in that City, and, with them, the Acts of the Council, which had been held

[q] Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 6, 11, 20, 29, 30, 35. ep. 96, 106. Hier. ep. 79. [r] Hier. ibid. [s] Aug. Gest. Pel. c. 1. Vide Noris hist. Pel. l. 2. c. 8. [t] Aug. ep. 90.

held Five Years before againſt *Cæleſtius*, not only condemned the Doctrine aſcribed to him and *Pelagius*, but declared, that the ſame Sentence ſhould be pronounced againſt them, unleſs they anathematized, in the plaineſt and moſt diſtinct Terms, the Errors with which they were charged [u]. The Example of the Biſhops of *Africa* was followed by thoſe of *Numidia*, aſſembled at *Milevum*, and by *Innocent* Biſhop of *Rome*, as I have related above.

This Condemnation, ſo ſolemn and general, was attended with the wiſhed for Effect. It greatly leſſened the Reputation of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, ſtaggered many of their Followers, and deterred others from embracing their Doctrines. Of this both *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* were well appriſed; and, at the ſame time, ſenſible, that the only means of retrieving their Credit, and maintaining the Ground they had gained, was to juſtify themſelves either to the Biſhops of *Africa*, or to the Biſhop of *Rome*, they choſe the latter, thinking it more eaſy to gain over one than many. Beſides, in *Africa* they knew St. *Auſtin*, who was in great Reputation there, and ſwayed all the Councils as he pleaſed, to be their declared and irreconcileable Enemy; whereas they had many Friends at *Rome*; and, among the reſt, the Preſbyter *Sixtus*, who was afterwards raiſed to that See [w]. In order, therefore, to perſuade the Biſhop of *Rome*, as *Pelagius* had done the Biſhops of *Dioſpolis*, that they had been falſly and maliciouſly accuſed, *Pelagius* wrote a Letter to *Innocent*, whoſe Death he had not yet heard of, while *Cæleſtius*, truſting to his Eloquence, and depending on the Favour which the Biſhops of *Rome* had always ſhewn to thoſe who recurred to them, undertook a Journey to that City. He had fled from *Carthage* to *Epheſus*, as I have related above. On his Arrival in that City he was well received by the Biſhop of the Place, and even

They appeal to Rome.

[u] Idem ibid. et ep. 95. [w] Aug. Pecc. Orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. ep. 104, 105. Proſp. in collat.

preferred, after he had stayed some time there, to the Priesthood. But, in the mean time, his Doctrine giving Offence to some, while it was embraced by others, great Disturbances arose; and he was, in the End, driven out of the City. Being thus expelled from *Ephesus*, he repaired to *Constantinople*; but he no sooner began to discover his Sentiments there, than *Atticus*, who then held that See, and kept a watchful Eye over him, commanded him forthwith to depart the City [x]. From *Constantinople* he went strait to *Rome*; and, finding that *Innocent* was dead, he presented himself before his Successor *Zosimus*, declaring, that he was come to *Rome*, to defend his oppressed Innocence at the Tribunal of the Apostolic See; not doubting but he should make it appear before so knowing and unprejudiced a Judge, and confute the many groundless Aspersions with which his Enemies had strove to blast his Reputation in the Eyes of the whole Church: he complained of the Judgment given against him by the *African* Bishops about Six Years before; and, pretending that his Accuser *Paulinus*, conscious of his Innocence and his own Guilt, had declined the Judgment of the Apostolic See, he summoned him anew to appear, and make good the Charge which he had brought against him. At the same time he presented to *Zosimus* a Request, containing a Confession of his Faith, with long Descants on the Articles of the Apostolic Symbol, concerning which his Orthodoxy had never been questioned. But as to *Grace* and *Original Sin*, he said, they were not Matter of Faith; but that he was, nevertheless, ready to acquiesce, even with respect to them, to the Judgment of the *Roman* See [y].

Zosimus had at this Time some Affairs of the greatest Importance on his Hands [z]; but, highly pleased

Cælestius is driven from Ephesus and Constantinople.

Repairs to Rome, and presents himself before Zosimus.

He delivers his Confession of Faith to Zosimus;

[x] Aug. ep. 90, 92. Hier. in Jer. Mercator. com. c. 1. [y] Aug. Gr. Ch. 30, 33. Peccat. Orig. c. 23. [z] Vide Bar. de ann. 417.

pleaſed with the pretended Submiſſion of *Cæleſtius*, and thinking this a favourable Opportunity of extending his Authority, and drawing to the Tribunal of the Apoſtolic See Appeals in Cauſes that had been judged and decided elſewhere, he poſtponed the other Affairs to attend to this alone, in his Opinion, the moſt important of all. A Day was appointed, without Loſs of Time, for *Cæleſtius* to appear in the Church of St. *Clement*, and there give an Account of his Faith. He appeared accordingly; and the Confeſſion being read, which he had delivered to *Zoſimus*, he owned that, and no other, to be his Faith. In that Confeſſion he did not deny Original Sin, but declared, in the cleareſt Terms, that he was in Doubt about it; and that the Belief of Original Sin was no Article of the Catholic Faith. And yet ſuch a Confeſſion was approved by *Zoſimus* as Catholic; which was approving, if not the Doctrine, at leaſt the Doubts which *Cæleſtius* entertained of Original Sin [a]. The *Roman* Catholic Divines have taken great Pains to clear *Zoſimus* from this Imputation; but have been attended with no better Succeſs than St. *Auſtin* was before them. For that Father, unwilling to condemn one of his Brethren, pretended that *Zoſimus*, in approving the Confeſſion of *Cæleſtius*, did not declare his Doctrine to be Catholic, but only the Diſpoſition of his Mind to condemn whatever ſhould be found amiſs in his Doctrine; for ſuch a Diſpoſition, ſayeth he, maketh a true Catholic [b]: he might have added, *if ſincere, and not feigned*; for it was certainly feigned in *Cæleſtius*; and conſequently *Zoſimus* was no leſs miſtaken in declaring his Diſpoſition of Mind to be Catholic, than if he had made ſuch a Declaration with reſpect to his Doctrine. St. *Auſtin* himſelf was ſenſible of the Weakneſs of his Plea, and therefore immediately added; *But, allowing*

which is approved by him.

The Roman Catholic *Divines ſtrive in vain to excuſe* Zoſimus.

[a] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 6. [b] Idem ad Bon. ibid.

ing the Doctrine of Pelagius *and* Cælestius *to have been approved by the* Roman *Church, all we can infer from thence is, that the* Roman *Clergy was guilty of Prevarication*[c]; an Inference which he seemeth to be noway solicitous about, although he could not have admitted it without giving up the Question, if he had thought the Pope infallible.

His haughty Letter to the African *Bishops in favour of* Cælestius.

Zosimus, however prejudiced in favour of *Cælestius*, did not take upon him to restore him to the Communion of the Church, from which he had been cut off by the Bishops of *Africa* six Years before, or to come to any farther Resolution until he had imparted the Affair to them. He wrote accordingly to *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, and to the other *African* Bishops; not that he stood in need of their Advice, or wanted to be directed by them, as he let them know in his Letter, but because he was willing to hear what they had to object against one who had been first accused at their Tribunal. He upbraids those Prelates, and with great Bitterness and Acrimony, as if they had acted with too much Haste and Precipitation in an Affair that required the most mature Deliberation. As for *Heros* and *Lazarus*, the two great Opposers of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, he inveigheth against them with the most abusive Language that an implacable Rage could suggest. He lets the *African* Bishops know, that if the Accusers of *Cælestius* did not appear at *Rome* in Two Months, to make good their Charge against him, he would declare him innocent, and admit him as a true Catholic to his Communion. He styleth all such Inquiries, that is, Inquiries concerning *Grace* and *Original Sin*, empty Speculations and trifling Disputes, owing to a criminal Curiosity, and an immoderate Desire of speaking and writing; in which perhaps he was not much to blame: he closeth his Letter with exhorting them not to trust to

[c] Idem ibid.

to their own Judgment, but to adhere in every thing to the Scripture and Tradition [d].

As for *Heros* and *Lazarus*, against whom *Zosimus* chiefly vented his Spleen, while he favoured *Cælestius*; St. *Prosper* giveth us, in his Chronicle, the following Account of the former: "*Heros*, sayeth "he, was Bishop of *Arles*, a holy Man, and the "Disciple of St. *Martin*. However, he was driven "from his See by his own People, although quite "innocent, and not even accused of any Fault. In "his room was placed one *Proculus*, an intimate "Friend of Count *Constantius*, who at that Time "bore a great Sway in the Empire, and whose Fa-"vour they courted, and hoped to earn, by that "Violence." This happened in 412. All we know of *Lazarus* is, that he was ordained Bishop of *Aix* in *Provence*, by *Proculus* Bishop of *Marseilles*, a Prelate of extraordinary Merit, as appeareth from the high Commendations bestowed on him by the Council of *Turin* [e], by St. *Jerom* [f], and by *Tiro Prosper* in his Chronicle. *Patroclus*, who was intruded in the room of *Heros*, is painted by *Tiro Prosper*, a Writer no-ways prejudiced against the *Pelagians* or their Friends, as a Man of a most abandoned Life, and one who turned the Episcopacy into a Trade, and sold the Priesthood to all who had Money to purchase it [g]. *Baronius* interprets the violent Death, which he suffered in 426, when he was barbarously murdered by a Military Tribune, as a Punishment from Heaven for his criminal Intrusion [h]. Such were the Characters of *Heros*, *Lazarus*, and *Patroclus*; and yet of the latter, who favoured the *Pelagians*, *Zosimus* entertained the highest Opinion, and often commendeth him in his Letters as a Man of great Merit and Virtue. But the Two former, who had distinguished themselves above the rest in opposing the

The Characters of Heros, Lazarus, and Patroclus.

Heros and Lazarus falsly charged with many Crimes by Zosimus.

[d] Mercat. comm. c. 1. Vide Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 19, 20, &c.
[e] Conc. t. 2. p. 1115. [f] Hier. ep. 4. [g] Tiro Prosp. p. 51.
[h] Bar. ad ann. 426. n. 26.

the *Pelagians*, he most outrageously abuseth, styling them, in his Second Letter to the *African* Bishops, *Two Plagues*, who, with their nonsensical Whims, disturbed the Peace and Tranquillity of the whole Church; *Whirlwinds and Storms*, that could suffer none to enjoy any Quiet. He adds, that he was not at all surprised at their wickedly attempting to defame, with false Depositions and lying Evidences, a Layman, meaning *Pelagius*, who had served God so long with an untainted Reputation, and shining Virtues, since they had raised so many Storms in the Church, had contrived so many Plots, employed so many Engines, to compass the Ruin of their Brethren and Collegues in the Episcopacy[i]. No Mention is made by the Historians of those Times of any other Storms, or Disturbances, in the Churches of *Gaul*, but such as were occasioned by the Expulsion of *Heros*, and the Intrusion of *Patroclus*; and these *Proculus* probably exaggerated beyond Measure, laying the whole Blame on *Heros*. For *Proculus* was in *Rome* at the very Time *Zosimus* wrote his Letter to the *African* Bishops, fraught with Invectives against *Heros* and *Lazarus*[k]. In the same Letter *Zosimus* charges the Two Prelates with several other Crimes; *viz.* that they had both been ordained against the *Canons*, and against the Will of the People as well as the Clergy, whom, however, they had forced by Chains, Prisons, Confiscations, and the Favour of the Tyrant, meaning, no doubt, the Usurper *Constantine*, to consent in the End to their Election; that *Lazarus* had ascended the Episcopal Throne, while his Hands were still reeking with innocent Blood, *&c.* But, had they been guilty of such Excesses, would *Prosper*, who lived at this very Time, and all the other Historians, have passed them over in Silence? Would he have styled *Heros* an holy Man? Would St. *Austin* have called them both

[i] Bar. ibid. [k] Conc. t. 2. p. 1571.

both his holy Brethren [l]? Would the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage* in 416, have acknowleged them for their Fellow-Labourers and Collegues in the Prieſthood [m]? Would *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*, one of the moſt illuſtrious Prelates at that Time in *Gaul*, have ordained *Lazarus*, while his Hands were ſtill reeking with innocent Blood? We may therefore, upon the Whole, agree here with *Baronius* [n], and aſcribe the Crimes, of which the two Prelates were arraigned by *Zoſimus*, to the Suggeſtions of their Enemies, eſpecially of *Patroclus*, in whom *Zoſimus* repoſed an intire Confidence. However that be, *Zoſimus*, highly incenſed againſt both, not only declared them depoſed, as Men unworthy of the Epiſcopal Dignity, but cut them off from his Communion, *for many Reaſons*, ſayeth he, *and, among the reſt, becauſe they had depoſed themſelves* [o].

They are both degraded and excommunicated by Zoſimus.

This Sentence he pronounced in their Abſence, without even acquainting them with the Crimes laid to their Charge; not reflecting, in the Height of his Paſſion, that he was, at that very Time, complaining of the *African* Biſhops for having condemned *Cæleſtius* in his Abſence, reproaching them with too much Haſte and Precipitation, and laying it down as a Rule never to be ſwerved from, that no Man ought to be condemned before he is heard, let the Crimes laid to his Charge be ever ſo great. As for their *depoſing themſelves*, or voluntarily abdicating their Dignity, it is very certain, if *Proſper* is to be credited, that *Heros* did not abdicate, but was violently driven from, his See. If *Lazarus* abdicated (for Cardinal *Norris* [p] and others [q] are of Opinion he did not), that ought not to have been imputed to him as a Crime, no more than it was to *Nazianzen* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and many others, who were not even cenſured by their Enemies on that Account.

The Injuſtice of this Sentence.

[l] Aug. Geſt. Pel. c. 16. [m] Idem ep. 90. [n] Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 23. [o] Bar. ibid. n. 27, 28, 29. [p] Noris Hiſt. Pel. l. 1. c. 12. [q] Gallia Chriſtiana, t. 1. p. 2.

The other Bishops make no account of the Anathemas of Zosimus.

Account. The other Bishops seem to have made no Acount of the Anathemas of *Zosimus*; for they still continued to communicate with them, and acknowlege them for their Collegues [r]; the Name of *Heros* was inserted into the Diptychs of the Church of *Arles* after his Death; and *Lazarus* was, according to some, even restored to his See [s].

Pelagius *transmits to* Zosimus *a Confession of his Faith*;

Not long after *Zosimus* had wrote the Letter, which I have mentioned above, to the Bishops of *Africa* in favour of *Cælestius*, he received one from *Praylius* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, warmly recommending to him the Cause of *Pelagius*; and another from *Pelagius* himself, in his own Vindication, and with it a Confession of his Faith. These Letters were directed to *Innocent*; but he being dead before they reached *Rome*, they were delivered to *Zosimus*. In the Confession of Faith *Pelagius* owned, that *Baptism ought to be administered to Children as well as to the Adult*; and that, *notwithstanding our Free-will, we want the Assistance of Grace* [t]. Neither of these Propositions was inconsistent with, or repugnant to, his Doctrine; for although he denied Original Sin, he allowed Baptism to be administered even to Children, but *only for their Sanctification*. He admitted the Necessity of *Grace*, but not Grace as that Word was understood by St. *Austin* and the other Bishops who opposed him: for by Grace he meant no more than the Remission of Sins, Instruction, the Example of Christ. In this Confession he did not disown any of his Tenets; but, not thinking it safe or adviseable openly to own them, he industriously declined explaining himself more distinctly on either of the above-mentioned Heads. *Zosimus*, however fully satisfied with his Confession, and quite astonished (to use his own Words) at the rash Proceedings of the *African* Bishops, in condemning, as Heretics, Men whose

which he approves of.

[r] Merc. comment. c. 3. [s] Gall. Christ. ibid. [t] Aug. Gr. Ch. 30. & Pecc. Orig. c. 18, 19.

whose Doctrine was so sound and orthodox, immediately transmitted to *Aurelius* of *Carthage*, and his Collegues in *Africa*, the Confession as well as the Letter which had been sent him by *Pelagius*. On this Occasion he wrote himself a Second Letter to the *African* Bishops, which we may justly style a Panegyric on *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius*, and a bitter Invective against their Accusers, *Heros* and *Lazarus*. This Letter he concludeth with exhorting the Bishops of *Africa* to the Love of Peace and Unity, and condemning, as guilty of an Injustice unknown even to the Pagan *Romans*, those who gave Judgment in the Absence of the Persons accused, what Crimes soever were laid to their Charge [u], as I have observed above.

and censures the African Bishops for condemning him.

The *African* Bishops were no less surprised to find *Zosimus* so warmly engaged in favour of *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius*, than *Zosimus* was surprized at their having condemned them. However, they were determined to stand to the Judgment which they had given, although sensible that such a Determination would not fail to produce, if *Zosimus* did not yield, a Misunderstanding, and perhaps an intire Separation, between *Rome* and *Africa*. This St. *Austin* seemeth chiefly to have apprehended, and to have been resolved, if it should so happen, to abdicate and retire [w]. To prevent this Evil, which would have proved very detrimental to the common Cause, many Letters passed between *Rome* and *Africa* [x]: but as none of those that were written at this Juncture by the *African* Bishops have reached our Times, having been probably destroyed by those whose Interest it was to destroy them; all we know concerning this Affair is, that the *Africans* maintained, with great Steadiness, their former Judgment against the Pretensions of *Zosimus*; and would never allow a Cause, that had been determined in *Africa*, to

The African Bishops maintain their former Judgment.

[u] Bar. ad ann. 417. n. 25, 29.
[x] Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3.
[w] Hier. ep. 195, 209.

to be re-examined at *Rome*, the rather as *Innocent*, the Predeceſſor of *Zoſimus*, had concurred with them in condemning both *Cæleſtius* and his Doctrine[y]. The Letter from *Zoſimus* to the *African* Biſhops was carried by one *Baſilius*, Subdeacon of *Rome*, who was charged with a verbal Order for the Deacon *Paulinus*, the firſt who accuſed *Cæleſtius*, to repair to *Rome*. To this Summons *Paulinus* returned Anſwer, that as the Biſhops of *Africa* had condemned *Cæleſtius* upon his Accuſation, it was no longer incumbent upon him, but upon them, to ſhew that his Accuſation was well grounded; and therefore he could not conceive why *Zoſimus* ſhould require him to take a Journey to *Rome*[z].

Paulinus. ſummoned to Rome, *refuſes to obey the Summons.*

In the mean time *Aurelius* of *Carthage* was under the greateſt Apprehenſion leſt *Zoſimus* ſhould be prevailed upon by *Cæleſtius*, and the other *Pelagians* at *Rome*, to take ſome haſty Step in their Favour. Having therefore aſſembled, with all poſſible Expedition, a Council at *Carthage*, he firſt wrote, in his own and their Name, to *Zoſimus*, earneſtly intreating him to ſuſpend all further Proceedings in an Affair of ſuch Moment, until he was more fully informed. This Letter was wrote, and a Meſſenger diſpatched with it to *Rome*, while the Council was yet very thin; the Haſte *Aurelius* was in to ſtop the Proceedings of *Zoſimus* not allowing him to wait the Arrival of all. When the reſt came, and they were in all Two hundred and Fourteen, they unanimouſly confirmed their former Sentence, and, without waiting for the Judgment of *Zoſimus*, condemned anew the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*[a]. The Decrees which they made on this Occaſion againſt the *Pelagians* were received, ſayeth *Proſper*, by *Rome*, by the Emperors, no doubt, *Honorius* and *Arcadius*, and by the whole World[b]. And

The Council of Carthage *condemns anew the* Pelagian *Doctrine without waiting for the Judgment of* Zoſimus.

[y] Aug ib. & Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 4, & Queſnel. in Leon. oper. p. 676. [z] Queſnel. ibid. p. 675. [a] Proſp. chr. & in coll. c. 10. [b] Proſp. chron. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 2.

And yet, in the making of theſe Decrees, the Biſhop of *Rome* had no Hand; ſo that it was not *Rome*, but *Africa*; it was not the Pope, but the Biſhops of *Africa*, or more truly St. *Auſtin* (for he governed intirely that Council) who taught the Church what ſhe was to believe, and what diſbelieve, concerning *Grace* and Original Sin. One of theſe Decrees is related by *Proſper*[c], wherein the Two hundred and Fourteen Biſhops declare, that *we are aided by Grace, not only in the Knowlege, but in the Practice, of Virtue; and that without it we can neither think, ſpeak, or do any thing whatſoever that is pious or holy*[d]. This, and the other Decrees of the Council, were ſent immediately to *Rome*, by the Fathers who compoſed them, with a Letter for *Zoſimus*, declaring that they were determined to adhere to the Judgment, which his Predeceſſor *Innocent* had formerly given againſt *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, until ſuch time as both owned, and in the moſt plain and unexceptionable Terms, the Neceſſity of Grace, and abjured the oppoſite Doctrine. It was the Effect of a refined Policy in the *African* Biſhops not to mention their own Judgment, but to lay the whole Streſs on that of *Innocent*, although his was not only preceded, but produced, or rather extorted, by theirs. They hoped that the Regard, which they pretended to have for *Innocent*, would bring *Zoſimus* to a better Temper, and divert him from abſolving thoſe whom his Predeceſſor had ſo lately condemned. As *Zoſimus* had reproached them in his Letter for believing too eaſily thoſe who had appeared againſt *Cæleſtius*, they in their turn repreſented to him, that he ought not ſo eaſily to have believed *Cæleſtius*, and thoſe who ſpoke in his Favour. In the ſame Letter they gave him a particular Account of all that had paſſed in *Africa* concerning *Cæleſtius*. No wonder therefore that *Zoſimus* ſhould have complained of the Length of their Letter, calling

The Policy of the African Biſhops.

[c] Proſp. in Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3 [d] Idem ibid.

calling it a Volume, and saying that *he had got through it at last* [e]. With this Letter *Marcellinus*, Subdeacon of the Church of *Carthage*, was dispatched to *Rome*, and arrived there in the Beginning of *March* 418.

Zosimus *begins to yield.*

Zosimus was alarmed at the Steadiness of the *Africans*. He plainly saw from their Letter, and more plainly from their Decrees, that they were determined not to yield; and therefore, apprehending the evil Consequences that would infallibly attend his continuing to protect *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* against them, he resolved to yield, and withdraw, by Degrees, his Protection from both. Hence, in his Answer to the Council, he contented himself with

His boasting Letter to the African *Bishops.*

setting forth and boasting the Pre-eminence, Authority, and Prerogatives of the Apostolic See; which however, more modest than his Predecessor, he did not ascribe to Divine Institution, but to the Canons of the Church, and Prescription. He tells the *African* Bishops, that although he is vested with a Power of judging all Causes, although his Judgement is irreversible, yet he had chosen to determine nothing without having first consulted them; and this he dwelleth upon as an extraordinary Favour. He expresseth great Surprize at their seeming to be persuaded, that he had given an intire Credit to *Cælestius*, assures them that he had not been so hasty, being well apprised that the last and definitive Judgement ought not to be given but with the greatest Caution, and after the most mature Deliberation; and in the Close of his Letter lets them know, that, upon the Receipt of their first Letter, he had suspended all further Proceedings; and, to gratify them, left Things in the State they were in before [f].

In

[e] Prosp. ibid. l. i. c. 2. Aug. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. & Pecc. Orig. c. 8. Bar. de ann. 418. n. 5, 12.

[f] Bar. ibid.

In the mean time the *African* Biſhops, aſſembling in Council at *Carthage*, from all the Provinces of *Africa*, and ſome even from *Spain*, the more effectually to oppoſe and defeat any further Attempts of *Zoſimus*, in favour of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, condemned their Doctrine anew, and more diſtinctly than they had hitherto done. This Council met on the 1ſt of *May* 418. conſiſted of 225 Biſhops, and enacted Eight Canons, anathematizing the *Pelagian* Doctrine concerning Grace and Original Sin g. To theſe Eight Canons they added Ten more, calculated to eſtabliſh ſome Points of Diſcipline. Among the latter the Ninth deſerveth particular Notice; for it is there decreed, That Preſbyters, Deacons, and inferior Clerks, if they complain of the Judgment of their own Biſhop, may appeal, with his Conſent, to the neighbouring Biſhops, and from them to the Primate or Council of *Africa*. *But, if any one ſhould preſume*, ſay they, *to appeal beyond Sea, let no Man receive him to his Communion* h. To this Decree *Gratian* hath added, to ſave the Juriſdiction of the Pope, *unleſs they appeal to the See of* Rome; than which nothing can be more abſurd, ſince it was to reſtrain the encroaching Power of the See of *Rome* that this Canon was made. We muſt not forget that St. *Auſtin* was preſent at this Council, and ſigned this, as well as the other Canons and Decrees, that were, on this Occaſion, enacted by the 225 Biſhops.

The Doctrine of Pelagius *condemned again in a Council at* Carthage.

Appeals beyond Sea forbidden by the Council, on Pain of Excommunication.

The *Africans* had diſpatched, the Year before, the Biſhop *Vindemialis* to the Court of *Honorius*, with the Decrees of the Council held againſt *Pelagius*, of which I have ſpoken above. And thoſe Decrees the Emperor not only approved, but enacted this Year 418, a ſevere Law againſt the *Pelagians*, dated from *Ravenna*, the 30th of *April*, and addreſſed to *Palladius* then *Præfectus Prætorio*. *Honorius* there declareth,

Law enacted by Honorius *againſt the* Pelagians.

g Conc. l. 2. p. 1121. Aug. ep. 47. Nor. hiſt. Pel. p. 88.

h Conc. l. 2. p. 1064.

clareth, he had been informed, that *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* taught, in Oppoſition to the Authority of the Catholic Church, that God had created the firſt Man mortal; that he would have died, whether he had or had not ſinned; that his Sin did not paſs to his Deſcendents; and ſeveral other impious Errors, that diſturbed the Peace and Tranquillity of the Church. To put a Stop therefore to the growing Evil, he commandeth *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* to be driven from *Rome*; ordereth it to be every-where notified, that all Perſons ſhall be admitted before the Magiſtrates, as Informers againſt thoſe who are ſuſpected of holding their wicked Doctrines; and ſuch as are found guilty ſhall be ſent into Exile [i]. In virtue of this Law, an Order was iſſued by the *Præfecti Prætorio*, *viz.* by *Junius Quartus Palladius* Prefect of *Italy*, *Monaxius* Prefect of the Eaſt, and *Agricola* Prefect of *Gaul*, commanding *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius* to be driven out of *Rome*, and the Accomplices of their Errors to be ſtript of their Eſtates, and condemned to perpetual Baniſhment [k]. A moſt barbarous Treatment for holding Opinions, which, if erroneous, were certainly harmleſs. But it is uſual for a perſecuting Spirit to be as violent upon the moſt uneſſential as the moſt weighty Points: and the Rage of Diſputation is never more keen, than when the Diſputants can hardly define what they quarrel about; eſpecially when the Sword of the Magiſtrate is drawn on that Side which hath leaſt to ſay for itſelf in Reaſon and Argument. I do not affirm this was the Caſe in the preſent Diſpute; but this is certain, that if *Pelagius* went too far in his Opinion, ſo did his Oppoſers in theirs: and ſo far his Conduct was infinitely better than theirs, that he declared his own Notions to be Matters very indifferent to the Catholic Faith, and profeſſed a general Aſſent to that Faith; whereas they anathematized his Opinions

[i] Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 20. [k] Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 4. Nor. hiſt. Pel. p. 88.

Opinions as execrable Errors, and punished them with all the Severity that the most implacable Malice could exert (B).

Pelagius and *Cælestius* being thus condemned by the Decrees of the *African* Bishops, by the Law of the Emperor, and even by the Voice of the People, or rather of the Populace, who were every-where ready, but no-where more than at *Rome*, to rise against the *Enemies of Grace*, as they were styled, and their Abettors; *Zosimus* thought it not safe to afford them any further Protection, unless *Cælestius*, who was still at *Rome* (the Imperial Law not being yet published there), consented to anathematize the Doctrines ascribed to him and *Pelagius*, in such clear and precise Terms as should leave no room, even for his Enemies, to question his Sincerity. He therefore appointed a Day for the *Roman* Clergy, and the neighbouring Bishops, to assemble; and, acquainting *Cælestius* with this Resolution, he summoned him to appear at the Time appointed, that, by condemning whatever he should be required to condemn, he might be publicly restored to the Communion of the Church, from which he had been cut off by the *African* Bishops. *Cælestius* was greatly perplexed with this Summons: he conceived it impossible to dissemble any longer his real Sentiments: but, at the same time, thinking it base to renounce them, and foreseeing the Consequences that would infallibly attend his avowing them, after he had been long in Suspence what Expedient to resolve on, he concluded at last, that the best and safest was privately to withdraw from *Rome*, and keep himself concealed until the present Storm was blown over. This Expedient he chose, and put it in Execution with such Secrecy, that he was no more heard of until

Zosimus summons Cælestius to appear before him, and to condemn his Doctrine.

Cælestius instead of appearing retires from Rome.

(B) *Honorius* supposeth, and likewise his Prefects, *Pelagius* to have been in *Rome*, when this Law was enacted; but it is very certain, that he was then in *Palæstine*.

until Three Years after, when he appeared again in *Rome* [m].

In the mean time the appointed Day came; but *Cælestius* did not appear: he was summoned anew, and the Proceedings were adjourned for a few Days; but as he still absented himself, and no Tidings could be heard of him, *Zosimus* was so provoked in seeing himself thus deluded, that, without further Examination, he condemned the Confession of Faith, which he had approved before; confirmed the Sentence of the *Africans*, which he had so sharply censured; and, anathematizing the Doctrine both of *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, declared the one and the other cut off from the Communion of the Church, if they did not publicly renounce and abjure *the poisonous Tenets of their impious and abominable Sect* [n]. He did not stop here; but, to retrieve his Reputation, which had suffered greatly on this Occasion, and to atone, by an opposite Zeal, for that which he had hitherto exerted in their Favour, he wrote a long circular Letter to all the Bishops, anathematizing the Doctrine of *Pelagius*, and exhorting them to follow his Example. Copies of this Letter were sent into all the Provinces of the Christian World, and out of so great a Number of Bishops Eighteen only were found, who refused to receive it, and confirm, with their Subscriptions, the Anathemas it contained [o].

Zosimus condemns the Confession, which he had approved before.

Excommunicates Pelagius *and* Cælæstius.

And writes a circular Letter against them.

Some Bishops refuse to sign it.

As for the Eighteen Bishops, who refused to join the rest, they alleged, that they could not, in Conscience, condemn any Man in his Absence, and that it was but just they should first hear what he had to plead in his Defence, quoting to that Purpose the very Passages of Scripture which *Zosimus* had quoted in his Letter to the *Africans*, censuring them for condemning *Pelagius* in his Absence. They added, that,

[m] Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 8. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mar. Merc. comm. c. 1. [n] Aug. Pecc. orig. c. 3, & 4. in Jul l. 1. c. 4. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 3. Mercat. ubi supra. Prosp. chr. & Ingrat. l. 1. c. 3. [o] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. Conc. t. 3. p. 349. Prosp. chr. Merc. c. 3.

that, as for *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, they had condemned, in their Writings, the Errors imputed to them, and therefore did not deſerve, in their Opinion, the Anathemas that *Rome* and *Africa* had, perhaps too haſtily, thundered againſt them. *Julian*, Biſhop of *Eclana* in *Campania*, one of the Eighteen, and the moſt diſtinguiſhed among them, wrote Two Letters on this Subject to *Zoſimus*, one of which was ſigned by them all, and contained a Confeſſion of their Faith, agreeing, in the moſt material Points, with the Confeſſions of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*. For there they abſolutely reject, and in the ſtrongeſt Terms, Original Sin, under the Name of *Natural Sin*; but allow (and in this Article alone they differ from *Pelagius*), that by the Sin of *Adam* Death was let into the World. They intreat *Zoſimus* to acquaint them with what ſhould be found amiſs in their Confeſſion; but beg, that he would not think of employing Force, ſince no Force but that of Conviction could produce in them a Change of Sentiments. They let him know, in the End of their Letter, that they have already appealed to the Judgment of an Oecumenical Council [p]. *Zoſimus* was ſo provoked at this Appeal, that, upon the Receipt of the Letter, he aſſembled, in great Haſte, a Council, conſiſting of the *Roman* Clergy, and the neighbouring Biſhops; and, having cauſed the Letter to be read in their Preſence, he condemned anew *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, and with them *Julian*, and the other Biſhops, who ſigned it, declaring them guilty of the ſame Errors, and in Conſequence thereof degraded, as incorrigible Heretics, from the Epiſcopal Dignity. The Prelates, thus degraded, had recourſe to the Emperor *Honorius*, complaining of the undeſerved Severity of *Zoſimus*, and intreating him to convene, by his Authority, an Oecumenical Council, to the Judgment of which they were ready to ſubmit both themſelves and their Doctrine. The Emperor ſeemed at firſt inclined

And ſend a Confeſſion of their Faith to Zoſimus.

They are condemned and degraded by Zoſimus.

They recur to the Emperor for a general Council.

[p] Merc. ſubnot. p. 320—326.

clined to grant them their Requeſt. But Count *Valerius*, a great Friend of St. *Auſtin*, and then very powerful at Court, not only diverted *Honorius* from it, but prevailed upon him to enact a Law, baniſhing from *Italy* *Julian*, and with him all the Biſhops, whom *Zoſimus* had depoſed [q]. This Law was ſoon followed by another, commanding all Biſhops to ſign the Condemnation of *Pelagius* and *Cæleſtius*, on Pain of Depoſition, and perpetual Baniſhment [r]. The *Pelagians* interpreted their being refuſed a Council, as a Token of Victory; whence *Julian*, in a Letter which he wrote to his Friends in *Rome*, inſulteth his Adverſaries, as if they had diſtruſted their Cauſe, and therefore declined the Judgment of the Oecumenical Council [s]. In another Place he reproacheth St. *Auſtin* in particular, for courting the Friendſhip of Men in Power, eſpecially of Count *Valerius*, with no other View but to cruſh, by their means, thoſe whom he could not convince. St. *Auſtin* anſwered, *That Recourſe indeed had been had to Men in Power, but that the* Pelagians *ought rather to be thankful, than to complain, on that Score, ſince it was not to cruſh them, or to do them the leaſt Hurt* (for they were only driven from their Sees, and baniſhed for Life), *that the Intereſt and Power of great Men had been made uſe of, but merely to reclaim them from their ſacrilegious Temerity* [t]. Might not a *Decius*, a *Dioclesian*, or any other Perſecutor of the Church, have uſed the ſame Plea to juſtify his Perſecution?

Who iſſues ſeveral Laws againſt them.

About this time, that is, in the Latter-end of the Year 418, or the Beginning of 419, the Doctrine of *Pelagius* was condemned in a Council held at *Antioch*, at which preſided *Theodotius* Biſhop of that City; and in another, that met about the Year 421, in *Cilicia*, under the famous *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia*, who

The Pelagian Doctrine condemned by Two Councils in the Eaſt.

[q] Aug. op. imperf. l. 1. c. 10. ad Val. p. 343, Conc. t. 2. p. 1558. [r] Mer. Com. c. 3. Nor. hiſt. Pel. l. 1. c. 16. [s] Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 1. ad Bon. l. 2. c. 24. [t] Aug. op. imperf. l. 2. c. 14.

who had been hitherto an avowed Patron of the *Pelagians*, had received *Julian* when driven out of *Italy*, and even written a Book againſt St. *Auſtin*, in Defence of the *Pelagian* Doctrine [u]. His Converſion was perhaps owing, as that of many others certainly was, to the ſevere Laws enacted againſt the *Pelagians*. Soon after the Council of *Antioch*, *Pelagius*, whom *Jerom* ſtyles the *Second Catiline*, was driven from *Jeruſalem*, where he had lived a long time, and obliged to fly to ſome other Place for Shelter [w]. Whither he retired, or what became of him afterwards, is not recorded. St. *Auſtin* ſuppoſeth both him and *Cæleſtius* to have been ſtill alive, while he was writing againſt *Julian*, that is, about the Year 421 [x]. As for *Cæleſtius*, it appeareth from a Reſcript, or rather a Letter, of the Emperor *Conſtantius* to *Voluſianus*, Prefect of *Rome*, in 421, that he was then in that City. For *Conſtantius* writeth to *Voluſianus*, that although he had enacted ſome Laws againſt the antient as well as modern Hereſies, yet he was informed, that they made daily great Progreſs; and therefore, to prevent the Diſturbances that muſt ariſe from thence, he commands the Laws to be put in Execution, and the Enemies of the true Religion to be carefully ſought for, eſpecially *Cæleſtius*, and to be baniſhed, if apprehended, an Hundred Miles from *Rome*. To this Letter the Emperor added, with his own Hand, by way of Poſtſcript, that the Reputation of *Voluſianus* depended on the punctual Execution of this Order [y]. In Obedience to the Emperor's Commands, *Voluſianus* iſſued a Proclamation, baniſhing *Cæleſtius* an Hundred Miles from *Rome*, and threatening with Proſcription all who ſhould preſume to conceal him [z]. *Cæleſtius* however appeared again in *Rome* Three Years after, and even applied to *Cæleſtine*, then in that See, to have his Cauſe examined anew. But *Cæleſtine*, rejecting his

Pelagius *driven from* Jeruſalem.

Cæleſtius *returns to* Rome.

Laws iſſued againſt him.

[u] Merc. Comm. c. 3. [w] Hier. ep. 55. [x] Aug. in Jul. l. 2. c. 10. [y] Bar. ad ann. 420. n. 2. [z] Phot. c. 53.

Request with Indignation, caused him to be banished all *Italy* [a]. From *Rome* he repaired to *Constantinople*, with *Julian*, and the other Bishops of the *Pelagian* Party, who all met there with a more kind Reception. The Emperor *Theodosius* the younger was even inclined to assemble, at their Request, a great Council; and *Nestorius*, then Bishop of *Constantinople*, wrote to the Pope in their Favour. But, in the mean time, *Marius Mercator* having composed, and presented to the Emperor, a Memorial against them, they were ordered by *Theodosius*, in virtue of that Memorial, to depart the City [b]. Of *Cælestius* no farther Mention is made by any of the Antients. As for *Julian*, he wandered, for several Years, from Place to Place, being every-where abhorred, detested, and driven out by the Populace, as if his Presence had been enough to draw down from Heaven some remarkable Judgment upon them. However, he found an Asylum at last in a small Village of *Sicily*, where he earned a Livelihood by keeping a School, until the Year 455, when he died, after he had divested himself of all he had, to relieve the Poor of the Place in a great Famine [c]. He was a Man of a sprightly Genius, thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures, well versed in all the Branches of polite Literature, especially in the *Greek* and *Latin* Poets, and once famous among the Doctors of the Church [d]. He was descended from an illustrious Family. His Father was an *Italian* Bishop, for whom St. *Austin*, notwithstanding his irreconcileable Aversion to the Son, professed the greatest Friendship and Veneration [e]. His Mother was a Lady of the first Quality, and yet more commendable for her Virtue than her Birth [f]. His Enemies, envying him even his noble Descent, strove to rob him of that Honour, small as it is, in Comparison of his other Endowments, by giving out, that

Is banished all Italy.

Is driven from Constantinople, *together with* Julian *and the other* Pelagian *Bishops.*

Julian *dies in* Sicily.

His Birth, Education, &c.

[a] Prosp. in Coll. c. 41. [b] Vid. Garn. in Mercat. p. 144. [c] Gennad. c. 45. [d] Idem ibid. [e] Aug. in Jul. l. 1. c. 4. & op. imperf. l. 1. c. 68. [f] Merc. subnot. c. 4. Aug. op. imperf. p. 22.

that he was a ſuppoſititious Child [g]. He was admitted by his Father among the Clergy, when he was yet very young, and married, when he was of a more mature Age, to a Lady named *Ja*, of a Senatorial, nay of the *Æmilian*, Family, and the Daughter of *Æmilius* Biſhop of *Benevento* [h]. St. *Paulinus*, Biſhop of *Nola*, did not think it beneath him to write an Epithalamium on this Occaſion, of a moſt ſingular kind; for he adviſeth him and his Bride to continue Virgins, and obſerve Continency [i]. A very extraordinary Advice on a Wedding-Day! That the married Couple agreed to it then, we are not told; but, not long after, probably on the Death of his Wife, *Julian* bound himſelf to the Obſervance of Continency; for he was ordained Deacon, and ſoon after raiſed to the See of *Eclana* [k]. He had long before embraced the *Pelagian* Doctrine; and was ſo fully convinced of the Truth of it, that he often declared, if *Pelagius* himſelf ſhould renounce his Doctrine, yet he would not [l]. Theſe Sentiments he maintained to the laſt, chuſing rather to be driven from his See, and deprived of all the Comforts of Life, than to abjure Opinions which he thought true, or admit Opinions which he thought falſe. He was buried in the Place where he died; and his Tomb was diſcovered in the Ninth Century, with the following Epitaph; *Here reſteth in Peace* Julian *a Catholic Biſhop*. From this Epitaph ſome have concluded, that he renounced at laſt the *Pelagian* Doctrine, and died a good Catholic. But they were not, it ſeemeth, aware, that the *Pelagians* conſtantly ſtyled themſelves Catholics, ſtigmatizing St. *Auſtin*, and the reſt who oppoſed them, with the Name of *Manichees*.

The Semipelagian *Doctrine.*

Julian is ſuppoſed to have diſſented in ſome Points from *Pelagius*, in thoſe eſpecially that relate to Grace, and thereby to have introduced, or laid down ſuch Principles

[g] Merc. ib. p. 40. [h] Paulin. car. 14. [i] Idem ibid.
[k] Aug. in Jul. l. 3. c. 21. et l. 4. c. 11. Mer. Comm. c. 3.
[l] Aug. ep. 106.

Principles, as naturally tended to introduce the *Semipelagian* Doctrine; which may be reduced to the following Heads: 1. That when the Truth hath been sufficiently declared, we may, by our own Freewill, without the Help of preventing Grace, begin to believe it; so that the first Beginning of our Faith cannot be properly called a *Gift of God*, but, *our own Act*. 2. That for all other good Works Grace is necessary (and here they differed from the *Pelagians*); but is never denied to a Man, who, by the good Use of his Freewill, hath begun to believe. Thus, according to them, Grace was the Reward of Faith, and not Faith the Effect of Grace, which was the Doctrine of St. *Austin*. 3. That, by Grace preceding our Merits, no more can be meant, than the natural Grace and Bounty of God, given to Man in his Reason, and the natural Faculties of his Soul; by the good Use of which he may render himself worthy of the extraordinary Grace that is necessary for him to work out his Salvation. 4. That the Children who die before they attain to the Years of Discretion, are eternally rewarded or punished, according to the good or bad Life they would have led, had they attained to the Years of Discretion. A most impious Tenet! making God punish Sins with eternal Misery that were never committed: yet not quite so impious as that of St. *Austin*; who, without having recourse to the Supposition of Crimes foreseen, supposed innocent Children to be eternally damned for a Crime committed by *Adam*, if, by the Fault of their Parents, they were not baptized. Other Tenets of the *Semipelagians* were these: 5. That the Notion of Election and Reprobation, independent on our Merits or Demerits, is maintaining a fatal Necessity, is the Bane of all Virtue, and serveth only to render good Men remiss in working out their Salvation, and to drive Sinners to Despair. 6. That the Decrees of Election and Reprobation are posterior to, and in consequence of, our good or evil

evil Works, as foreseen by God from all Eternity. On these Two last Propositions the *Jesuits* found their whole System of *Grace* and Freewill, agreeing therein with the *Semipelagians* against the *Jansenists* and St. *Austin*; although, not daring to contradict *the Doctor of Grace*, as he is styled, they pretend their Doctrine, and not that of the *Jansenists*, to be the true Doctrine of St. *Austin*; which hath occasioned endless Disputes, and endless Volumes. The latter Popes have all favoured the *Semipelagians* or *Jesuits*, against the *Jansenists* and St. *Austin*; and *Clement* XI. above all the rest, by his famous Bull *Unigenitus*. But the Popes who lived nearer those Times, especially *Gelasius* and *Hormisda*, were all zealous Asserters of the Doctrine of St. *Austin*; nay, *Hormisda* declared the Doctrine contained in the Books of that Father, namely, in those he wrote on *Predestination* and *Perseverance*, to be the Doctrine of the Catholic Church; which was declaring every true Catholic to be a *Predestinarian*[m]. For the Doctrine of Predestination (as Predestination hath been since understood by *Calvin* and his Followers) is there laid down in the plainest Terms; which so shocked some Persons, otherwise eminent for their Piety, say *Prosper* and *Hilarius*[n], that they could not help censuring it, as a Doctrine repugnant to the Sense of the Church and the Fathers; nay, as a Doctrine, which, were it even true, ought not to be made public, since it was not necessary that Men should know it; and if they did, it would render all Exhortations to good Works vain and useless[p]. But these, say the *Jesuits*, pretending their System to be the pure Doctrine of St. *Austin*, misunderstood that Father, as did *Faustus* the famous Abbot of *Lerins*, when he wrote, *That if it be true, that some are predestined to Life, and others to Destruction, as a certain holy Man* (St. *Austin*) *hath said, we are not born to be judged, but we are judged before we*

The System of the Jesuits *founded on the* Semipelagian *Doctrine.*

[m] Concil. t. 4. p. 1531. [n] Prosp. et Hil. Literæ ad Aug. l. 7. p. 542—546. [p] Prosp. et Hil. ibid.

we are born; *so that there can be no Equity in the Day of Judgment* q. To speak impartially, it is no easy Matter to determine what System St. *Austin* had formed to himself, with respect to Grace, Freewill, and Predestination: for, in one Place, he seemeth to reject and condemn what he had been labouring to prove and establish in another. Hence *Julian*, whose Understanding was far more methodical, used often to quote him against himself, as the *Jesuits* and *Jansenists* still do in maintaining their Systems, although diametrically opposite, to be intirely agreeable to his Doctrine. He was apt to run into Extremes, and, in confuting one Error, to lay a Foundation for many others. Hence even his greatest Admirers are often at a Loss how to make him agree either with the Church or himself. However, his great Knowlege in those Days, his extraordinary Zeal for what he called the Catholic Doctrine, and, above all, his heaping daily Volumes upon Volumes against all who opposed it, so dazled the Understandings of the Popes themselves, that, looking upon him as an inspired Writer, they suffered him to dictate even to them, as if he had been Pope, and they common Bishops; as if Infallibility had been transferred from *Rome* to *Hippo*, and no longer vested in them, but in him.

Zosimus quarrels with some Bishops of Gaul.

But to return to *Zosimus*: As his Partiality to *Pelagius* and *Cælestius* occasioned a Quarrel between him and the *African* Bishops; his Partiality to *Patroclus*, who had usurped the See of *Arles*, as I have related above r, occasioned, in like manner, a Quarrel between him and some Bishops of *Gaul*; and from the latter he reaped no more Credit or Honour, than he had done from the former. It arose on the following Occasion: The Bishops of *Arles* and *Vienne* had been long contending for the Metropolitan Dignity, and the Jurisdiction attending it, over the

The Occasion of this Quarrel.

q Vide Sirmond. hist. prædest. c. 1, 2, &c.

r See p. 336, 337.

the Provinces of *Narbonne* and *Vienne*: and the Deciſion of the Controverſy having been referred, ſome Years before, to a Council that was held in *Turin*, it had been there decreed, that the Biſhop who ſhould prove his City to be the Metropolis of thoſe Provinces, according to the Civil Diviſion of the Empire, ſhould enjoy the Metropolitan Dignity, and the Privileges annexed to it; but, in the mean time, to avoid any Breach of Charity, that both ſhould exerciſe the Juriſdiction of a Metropolitan over the Churches that were neareſt to their reſpective Cities [t]. Thus Matters continued, until *Patroclus* repairing to *Rome*, and there impoſing upon *Zoſimus*, who was quite unacquainted with the Merits of the Cauſe, prevailed upon him, by flattering his Vanity and Ambition, to decide, in his Favour, the Controverſy, which had been ſo long depending. *Zoſimus* cenſured very ſeverely, as I have obſerved above, the *African* Biſhops, for acting, as he pretended, with too much Haſte and Precipitation, in the Caſe of *Cæleſtius*. But, ſurely, no Man ever deſerved to be more juſtly cenſured, on that ſcore, than himſelf: for, not to mention the Caſe of *Heros* and *Lazarus*, whom he excommunicated and depoſed in their Abſence, and without hearing what they had to plead in their Defence, he took upon him to decide the preſent Controverſy, which a Council had left undetermined, upon the Information given him by one of the Parties concerned, without hearing the other: for, giving an intire Credit to all *Patroclus* ſaid or could ſay, in Behalf of himſelf and his Church, he wrote a Letter, addreſſed to all the Biſhops of *Gaul*, declaring, that, for the future, he would receive no Biſhops or Eccleſiaſtics coming to *Rome* from thoſe Provinces, unleſs they brought with them Letters of Communion, called *Formatæ*, from the Metropolitan of *Arles*, and excommunicating thoſe

[t] Conc. t. 2. p. 1156.

those who should transgress this Order [u] (A). The Privilege of granting the *Formatæ* was only personal; for *Zosimus* did not grant it to the See of *Arles*, but to *Patroclus*, whom he styleth his *holy Brother*, *in Consideration of his extraordinary Merit*. To such a Degree had he suffered himself to be imposed upon, by a Man, who was the Disgrace of his Order [w]. In the same Letter he vesteth him, as Bishop of *Arles*, with a Metropolitan Jurisdiction over the Province of *Vienne*, and the Two Provinces of *Narbonne*, adjudgeth to his See all the Parishes and Territories that had ever been subject to the City of *Arles*, and granteth him a full Power to decide and finally determine all Controversies that should arise in the three above-mentioned Provinces, provided they were not of such Consequence as required them to be examined at *Rome* [x]. The only Reason *Zosimus* allegeth for thus exalting the See of *Arles* to the Prejudice of the See of *Vienne*, is, because *Trophimus*, the First Bishop of *Arles*, had converted those Provinces to the Christian Religion. A Reason both false and impertinent: false, because *Trophimus* flourished in the Year 250 [y], and the Church of *Arles* was famous as early as the Year 177, when they wrote, with their Brethren of *Lions*, to the Faithful in *Asia* [z]: impertinent, because it was to the Dignity of each City, and to nothing else, that the Dignity of the Sees was owing. Hence the Council of *Turin* wisely adjudged the Metropolitan Dignity to him who should prove his City to be the Civil Metropolis, with respect to the contested Provinces, as I have observed above. *Zosimus*, however, wrote a second Letter, which he addressed

[u] Conc. t. 2. p. 1567. [w] See p. 449. [x] Conc. ib. p. 1567—1569. [y] Greg. Tur. hist. Franc. l. 1. c. 30. [z] Euseb. l. 5. c. 1.

(A) These Letters were given, in the primitive Times, to travelling Ecclesiastics, that their Brethren, in the Places through which they passed, knowing who they were, and whence they came, might admit them to their Communion.

addreſſed to all the Biſhops of *Gaul*, *Spain*, and *Africa*, confirming to the See of *Arles* all the Rights and Privileges which he had granted in his Firſt, and rejecting, with Scorn, the Decree of the Council of *Turin*[a].

The Biſhops of *Gaul*, *viz.* *Simplicius* of *Vienne*, *Hilarius* of *Narbonne*, and *Proculus* of *Marſeilles*, amazed and aſtoniſhed at the Temerity of the Biſhop of *Rome*, openly refuſed to acknowlege his Authority, or ſubmit to his Sentence. *Zoſimus*, highly provoked at the Oppoſition he met with, wrote ſeveral threatening Letters to *Hilarius* and *Proculus*, as if he were determined to cut them off from his Communion, if they did not yield, and acknowlege *Patroclus* for their Metropolitan. As for *Simplicius* he ſeemeth to have acted with leſs Vigour on this Occaſion than the other Two; and it was perhaps on that Account that he hath been ſainted. *Hilarius* too yielded at laſt, not to the Menaces of *Zoſimus*, which he made no Account of, but to thoſe of Count *Conſtantius*, the avowed Patron of *Patroclus*[b], whom he allowed, on that Conſideration, to ordain a Biſhop at *Lodeve*, within the Limits of his Province, which was owning him for his Metropolitan. But nothing could ſhake the Firmneſs and Conſtancy of *Proculus*. *Zoſimus*, thinking he could frighten him into a Compliance, began with reproachful Language; from Reproaches he proceeded to Menaces; and from Menaces, to ſummon him to *Rome*, to anſwer there for his preſuming to ordain Biſhops in a Province (the *Second Narbonneſe*) that had been adjudged by the Apoſtolic See to the Metropolitan of *Arles*. But *Proculus* made ſo little Account of his Reproaches, Menaces, and Summons, that I do not even find he returned them an Anſwer. It is at leaſt certain that he did not obey the Summons, and that he continued to exerciſe the ſame Juriſdiction, which he had exerciſed before, oppoſing to the repeated and peremptory

He is oppoſed by the Biſhops of Gaul,

eſpecially by Proculus *Biſhop of* Marſeilles.

[a] Conc. t. 2. p. 1568. [b] Conc. ibid. 1581.

tory Orders of *Zosimus* a Canon of the Council of *Turin*, appointing him Metropolitan of the *Narbonnensis Secunda* [c]. *Zosimus*, transported with Rage in seeing his Authority thus slighted, wrote Three Letters, all dated the 29th of *September* 417, *viz.* one to the People and Clergy of the Province of *Vienne*, another to those of the *Second Narbonnese*, and the third to *Patroclus*. In the Two former he inveigheth bitterly against *Proculus*, and confirmeth anew to *Patroclus* the Metropolitan Dignity and Jurisdiction, which have been so unalterably intailed, saith he, on the See of *Arles*, by the Decrees of the Fathers and Councils, that it exceedeth even the Power and Authority of the *Roman* Church to transfer them to, or intail them upon, any other [d]. This was disclaiming, in the plainest Terms, the Power of dispensing with the Canons, which hath since proved so beneficial to the Apostolic See. And yet *Zosimus* was acting the whole Time in direct Opposition to the Fourth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, vesting, as it was understood by the subsequent Councils, the Bishop of each Metropolis with the Metropolitan Dignity and Jurisdiction over the whole Province. *Zosimus*, in his Letter to *Patroclus*, encourageth him to resume and exercise, in spite of *Proculus*, the Metropolitan Jurisdiction over the *Second Narbonnese*, which *Proculus* had so unjustly invaded and usurped. This *Patroclus* durst not attempt, although seconded by the whole Power of the Apostolic See; which wrought the Pride, Ambition, and Resentment of *Zosimus* to such a Pitch, that, giving the Reins to his Passion, he thundered the Sentence of Excommunication against *Proculus*, declared him unworthy of, and degraded from, the Episcopal Dignity, and committing the Church of *Marseilles* to the Care of *Patroclus*, commanded him to exercise there the Jurisdiction with which he was vested. The Power of the Apostolic See was now exhausted, and

Proculus excommunicated and deposed by Zosimus.

[c] Conc. ibid. p. 1155. [d] Conc. t. 2. p. 1570.

and what drove *Zoſimus* almoſt to Deſpair, exhauſted to no Effect; for *Proculus*, to ſhew how little Regard he paid to the Sentence pronounced againſt him at *Rome*, ordained a Biſhop ſoon after he was acquainted with it. *Zoſimus*, ſenſible that the Authority of his See was here at ſtake, would not abandon the Attempt. He wrote Two Letters more on the ſame Subject, one to *Patroclus*, exhorting him to exert, with Vigour and Severity, the Power with which he was veſted; and at the ſame time commanding him to declare, in his Name, that he ſhould never be prevailed upon to acknowlege thoſe whom *Proculus* had ordained. The other Letter was to the People, Clergy, and Magiſtrates of *Marſeilles*, ſtirring them up againſt *Proculus*, and encouraging them to drive him out, and receive another in his room at the Hands of *Patroclus*. Theſe Letters occaſioned great Diſturbances in the Church of *Marſeilles*, which was now rent into two oppoſite Parties, ſome refuſing to acknowlege *Proculus*, and others declaring that they would acknowlege no other[e]. But, in ſpite of the utmoſt Efforts of *Zoſimus*, of *Patroclus*, and their Partiſans, *Proculus* ſtill kept his Ground, ſtill continued to exerciſe all Epiſcopal as well as Metropolitan Functions, as he had formerly done. He thought even the Bills attending a Schiſm of a leſs dangerous Tendency than thoſe which he apprehended from the Encroachments of the Biſhops of *Rome*. Had all the Prelates thus ſtood up in Defence of their juſt Rights and Privileges againſt the Papal Uſurpations, the Church had never been reduced to that deplorable Thraldom, which ſhe groaned under for ſo many Ages. But, alas! there have been in all Times but too many *Simpliciuſes*, who, out of a miſtaken Principle, have choſen rather to yield to an encroaching Power, than to raiſe Diſturbances, and forego their own Eaſe, by withſtanding it: but too many *Patrocluſes*, who, to

But continues to diſcharge the Functions of his Office.

His Steadineſs in oppoſing the Encroachments of Rome.

[e] Conc. ibid. 1574.

gratify their own Ambition, have prostituted their sacred Dignity to the ambitious Views of the Pope, and raised him, at the Expence of their own Order, that they might be raised by him in their Turn. *Proculus*, although deposed, excommunicated, calumniated by *Zosimus* and his Tools, kept to the last Possession of his See; nay, and was acknowleged for lawful Bishop of *Marseilles*, for Metropolitan of the *Second Narbonnese*, not only by the Bishops of *Gaul*, but likewise by those of *Africa*[f]. He was still alive in 427, when he condemned the Monk *Leporius* for maintaining Christ to have been born Man only, but to have deserved, by his good Works, to become God[g]. The Encomiums bestowed on him by the Council of *Turin*, by St. *Jerom*, and *Tiro Prosper*, as I have observed above, are a sufficient Confutation of all the Calumnies uttered against him by *Zosimus* and the rest of his Enemies.

Zosimus *dies.* The last Letters of *Zosimus*, that is, his Letters to *Patroclus* and the People of *Marseilles*, are dated the 5th of *March* 418, and he died in the Latter-end of the same Year, on the 26th of *December*, saith *Baronius*[h], upon the Authority, we may suppose, of some antient Pontifical (A).

The Distemper which he died of lasted a long time, and was attended with such violent Fits, that he was often thought to be dead before he died. It was during his Illness that he wrote his last Letters; and

[f] Du Pin. t. 3. p. 827. [g] Cassian. incar. l. 1. c. 4. [h] Bar. ad ann. 418. n. 72.

(A) He is said to have been buried near the Body of St. *Laurence*, on the *Tiburtine* Way, on the 25th or 26th of *December*, according to *Anastasius* the *Bibliothecarian* (1); but on the 27th, according to an antient Pontifical, which agreeth better with the Letters of *Symmachus* concerning the Election of his Successor *Boniface*: so that he may have governed One Year Nine Months and Eight or Nine Days, which is the Time that *Prosper* alloweth him (2).

(1) Anast. c. 42. (2) Vide Pontaci not. in chron. Prosp. p. 777.

and yet they are no leſs remarkable than the reſt for that Fire and Vivacity, that Strength of Expreſſion, and even that Elegance and Purity of Diction, that were peculiar to him. He was a Man of great Addreſs in the Management of Affairs; well knew how to turn every thing to his Advantage; and in the ſeveral Diſputes which he engaged in, he forgot nothing that could any-ways diſtreſs thoſe who oppoſed him. He was apt to engage too raſhly, giving an intire Credit to thoſe who, by a ſervile Submiſſion, flattered his Ambition; and when he had once engaged in a Cauſe, as he was of a haughty and imperious Temper, impatient of Controul, paſſionate, headſtrong, full of, and elated with, the Dignity of the *Apoſtolic See*, it required the greateſt Art and Addreſs in his Brethren to bring him into their Meaſures, and with-hold him from raiſing fatal Diviſions in the Church. His whole Conduct and Behaviour towards them, the haughty and peremptory Style which he aſſumed in writing to them ſufficiently ſhew that he looked upon them as infinitely below him, as bound to yield a blind Obedience to all his Commands, and ſubmit, without Reply, to all his Deciſions: and it is not to be doubted but, had he lived longer, and not met with the vigorous Oppoſition which he did from the Biſhop of *Marſeilles*, he would have made great Progreſs toward reducing his *Fellow-Miniſters* and *Fellow-Labourers*, as they are ſtyled by St. *Cyprian*, to that State of Dependence, not to ſay Slavery, which in the End they have been reduced to by his Succeſſors. He was the firſt who made uſe of the Expreſſion, *for ſo it hath pleaſed the Apoſtolic See*[1]; an Expreſſion which his Succeſſors have all adopted, as the Language of the higheſt Authority, and ſuch as exempted them from giving any Account either of their Actions, or of the Motives, that prompted them ſo to act. But, to paint *Zoſimus* to the Life, we want no other Colours than

His Character.

[1] Conc. t. 2. p. 1567.

those, which the *African* Bishops, who were but too well acquainted with him, have furnished us with in the Letter which they wrote to his Successor *Boniface*. *We hope*, say they, *that since it hath pleased the Almighty to raise you to the Throne of the* Roman *Church, we shall no longer feel the Effects of that worldly Pride and Arrogance, which ought never to have found room in the Church of Christ* [m]. In the same Letter they complain of their having been made to endure such things as it was almost impossible for them to endure, which however they were willing to forget. Hard indeed and tyrannical must the Treatment have been, which they met with at the Hands of *Zosimus*, since it could extort from so many venerable Prelates a Complaint of this Nature, and that in a Letter to his immediate Successor. *Zosimus* however hath been sainted, and is now worshiped by the Church of *Rome* as a great Saint, not so much in Regard of his own Merits, as by a Blunder of *Baronius* in revising and correcting the *Roman* Martyrology. The Case is pretty singular, and may not be thought quite unworthy of a Place here, by reason of the Consequences, which every Protestant Reader may draw from it. In the Martyrology of *Bede* was marked, *St.* Zosimus *Martyr, who suffered for the Confession of the Faith.* This Martyr an ignorant Transcriber mistook for the Pope of the same Name, and concerned to find so little said of so great a Saint, set down all he knew of him. This Copy *Baronius* perused, and reading there what the Transcriber had added of his own, concluded the Saint mentioned in that Place to be Pope *Zosimus*, and accordingly, upon the supposed Authority of *Bede*, allotted him a Place among the other Saints in the *Roman* Martyrology. As for his being said to have suffered Martyrdom for the Confession of the Faith, *Baronius* ascribed that to the Ignorance of the Transcriber, making but one Saint out of two, although they lived

Zosimus sainted by a Mistake of Baronius.

[m] Conc. t. 2. p. 1141.

lived at ſo great a Diſtance of time from each other; for the Martyr lived in the earlieſt Times, and is mentioned by St. *Polycarp*, who flouriſhed Two hundred Years and upwards before the Pontificate of *Zoſimus*. To this double Blunder of the Tranſcriber and *Baronius*, is *Zoſimus* indebted for the Worſhip and Honours that are publicly paid him in the Church of *Rome*. Indeed that Church is not more groſly deluded in paying an idolatrous Worſhip to Saints, upon the Authority of her *infallible Guide*, than in the Objects to whom that Worſhip is paid (A).

HONORIUS, **BONIFACE,** THEODOSIUS *the younger.*

Forty-firſt BISHOP *of* Rome.

ZOSIMUS being dead, great Diſturbances aroſe about the Election of his Succeſſor. *Eulalius*, whom Authors diſtinguiſh with the Title of Archdeacon, ſhutting himſelf up in the *Lateran* with part of the People, and ſome Preſbyters and Deacons, was there choſen by them in the room of *Zoſimus*. At the ſame time a great Number of the People, many Preſbyters, and ſome Biſhops, aſſembling in the

Year of Chriſt 419. *Schiſm in the Church of* Rome.

(A) *Bollandus*, to ſaint *Zoſimus* in a more honourable Way, ſuppoſeth him to have once had a Place in the Matryrology of St. *Jerom*; and complaineth of thoſe who have taken the Liberty to ſtrike out his Name. One would think he had found his Name in ſome Copy of that Martyrology, or at leaſt heard of it; but he ingenuoſly owns, that he never found it there himſelf, nor heard of any who did; adding, that nevertheleſs he is fully perſuaded it was once there, and that he cannot think otherwiſe; and it is upon his *not being able to think otherwiſe* that he foundeth his Suppoſition, his Complaints, and the Saintſhip of *Zoſimus* (1); which is allowing them to have no Foundation at all.

(1) Boll. conat. ad chronol. Pont. p. 61, 62.

the Church of St. *Theodora*, named the Presbyter *Boniface* to the vacant See. Both were ordained the same Day they were chosen; *Boniface*, by Nine Bishops, and in the Presence of Seventy Presbyters; *Eulalius*, by Three Bishops only, and in the Presence of a very small Number of Presbyters; but the Bishop of *Ostia* was one of the Three; and he claimed, from a Custom which had long obtained, the Right of ordaining the Bishop of *Rome*. *Symmachus*, Governor of the City, did all that lay in his Power to prevent this double Election; but not succeeding therein, he immediately dispatched an Express to the Emperor *Honorius*, then at *Ravenna*, with a Letter dated the 29th of *December* 418, acquainting him with what had passed. But his Account was not impartial: he represented *Eulalius* as lawfully chosen, and his Competitor as an Usurper. *Honorius* therefore, by a Rescript dated the 2d of *January* 419, ordered him to persuade *Boniface* to retire from *Rome*, to use Force, if Persuasions did not prevail, and to apprehend and punish the Ringleaders of the Sedition, if any should be raised on that Occasion. With this Rescript the Emperor dispatched *Aphrodisius* a Tribune and Notary; and *Symmachus* having received it on the 6th of *January*, sent early next Morning to the *Primiscrinius*, or first Secretary, with an Order for *Boniface* to attend him, and hear what he had to impart to him in the Emperor's Name, letting him know in the mean time that he must not take upon him to exercise any Episcopal Functions; for such was the Will and Pleasure of the Emperor. This Order *Boniface* received while he was holding an Assembly in the Church of St. *Paul* without the Walls, but paid no Regard to it; nay, those who attended him, falling on the Secretary who brought it, treated him very roughly, which *Symmachus* no sooner knew than he caused the Gates of the City to be shut, and kept *Boniface* out. In the mean time *Eulalius*, improving to his Advantage the Absence

Boniface and Eulalius both chosen.

The Governor of Rome and the Emperor favour Eulalius.

of

of his Competitor, repaired to the Church of St. *Peter*, took Poſſeſſion of it amidſt the loud Acclamations of his Partiſans, and exerciſed there all Epiſcopal Functions.

who takes Poſſeſſion of the Church of St. Peter.

The avowed Partiality of *Symmachus* for *Eulalius* left no room to doubt but he had miſinformed the Emperor. The Biſhops therefore, with the Preſbyters and People, who had choſen *Boniface*, thought it their Duty to tranſmit to him a candid and impartial Account of the late Tranſactions: and this they did accordingly, intreating the Emperor at the ſame time to revoke his former Order, and to ſummon both *Eulalius* and *Boniface* to Court, in order to try their Cauſe there. Their Requeſt appeared juſt; and *Honorius*, in Compliance with it, ſent an Order to *Symmachus*, dated the 13th of *January* 419, commanding him to ſuſpend the Execution of his former Order, and to notify to the Two Competitors, that they, and thoſe who ordained them, muſt repair to *Ravenna*, on pain to him who ſhould fail to appear there on the 8th of the enſuing *February*, of having his Election declared null. Several Biſhops were ſummoned to attend at the ſame time, *Honorius* thinking it proper that a Diſpute of that Nature ſhould be decided by none but Biſhops. However, to remove all Suſpicion of Partiality on his Side, he would not allow thoſe to ſit as Judges, who had been any-ways concerned in the Election or Ordination of either of the Competitors. The Biſhops met, but not being able to agree among themſelves, *Honorius* thought the Affair of ſuch Importance, that he put it off to the 13th of *June*, with a Deſign to have it decided then in a full Council. He wrote accordingly not only to the Biſhops of *Italy*, but to thoſe too of *Gaul* and *Africa*, inviting them to the Council, and acquainting them with the Time and Place of its meeting. In the mean while he ſtrictly injoined both *Boniface* and *Eulalius* to keep at a Diſtance from the City, leſt their Preſence ſhould occa-

The Friends of Boniface write to the Emperor,

who ſummons a Council to decide the Controverſy.

A more full Council ſummoned.

sion Disturbances there. But as *Easter* approached, he appointed *Achilleus* Bishop of *Spoleti*, who was of neither Party, to perform the Episcopal Functions at *Rome* during that Solemnity. This *Eulalius* could not brook; and therefore returning to *Rome*, in open Defiance of the Emperor's Orders, he assembled the People, seized on the *Lateran*, and, shutting the Doors against *Achilleus*, performed in that Basilic the Episcopal Functions usual at *Easter*. The Emperor, being acquainted by *Symmachus* with what had passed, was so provoked at his Disobedience and Temerity, that, by a Rescript dated from *Ravenna* the 3d of *April*, and received at *Rome* on the 8th of the same Month, he commanded *Symmachus* to drive *Eulalius* from the City, and to put *Boniface* in Possession of the disputed See; which was accordingly done (A).

Eulalius disobeys the Emperor, and is driven from Rome.

Boniface indebted to the Emperor for his Dignity.

Thus was an End put to the Schism; thus was *Boniface* placed on the *Roman* See, and vested with the Papal Dignity by the *Clemency of the Emperor*, as *Largus* Proconsul of *Africa* expresseth it in his Letter to the Bishops of that Province [p]; and not by the Authority of a Council consisting of Two hundred and Fifty-two Bishops, which some have brought down from the Clouds, without even letting us know where or when they assembled [q].

All we know of *Boniface* before his Election is, that he was the Son of one *Jucundus* a Presbyter [r], was stricken in Years, well versed in the Ecclesiastical Laws, of an unblemished Character; and, what enhanceth his Merit, chosen against his Will. Thus say his Friends, in the Letter which they wrote in his Behalf

[p] Bar. ib. n. 37. [q] Vid. Bar. ib. n. 34. & Baillet. vies de saints. 25 Oct. [r] Platina in Bon.

(A) The original Copies of the Letters from *Symmachus* to the Emperor, and of the Emperor's Rescripts to *Symmachus*, giving a full Account of the present Schism, are lodged in the *Vatican* Library, and have been thence copied by *Baronius* (1).

(1) Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 1—42.

Behalf to the Emperor *Honorius*[f]. His first Care, after he found himself in the quiet Possession of his See, was to prevent, for the future, so far as in him lay, the Cabals and Intrigues that might be formed at other Elections, as they had been at his, to the great Disturbance of the City, and Scandal of the Christian Religion. With this View he wrote to the Emperor, intreating him to restrain, by some severe Law, the Ambition of those who, trusting more to their Intrigues than their Merit, aspired to a Dignity that was due to Merit alone (A).

Boniface applies to the Emperor for a Law to restrain the Ambition of the Candidates to the Papacy.

The Emperor, in Compliance with so just a Demand, enacted a Law, well calculated to prevent effectually the Evil complained of, and keep the Ambition of the Candidates to the Papacy within due Bounds. For by this Law, when Two Persons were chosen, neither was to hold the Dignity, but the People and Clergy were to proceed to a new Election. This is the first Instance, that occurreth in History, of Princes intermeddling in the Election of the Pope; an Evil, saith F. *Pagi*, which, from small Beginnings, grew to such an Height as to reflect great Shame and Disgrace on the *Roman* Church[t]. But it must be observed, that the original Evil was the Corruption, the Violence, and the many Disorders which the Clergy and People were guilty of in those Elections. It was this which, at the Request of the Pope himself, called on the Emperors to interpose their Authority, as the only adequate Remedy to such Abuses. The succeeding Emperors followed the Example of *Honorius*, and the *Gothic* as well as the *Lombard* Kings the Example of the Emperors, as we shall see in the Sequel of the present History.

His Law for that Purpose.

Boniface was naturally a Lover of Peace, and an Enemy to all Strife and Contention. He did not claim,

Boniface free from Ambition.

[f] Apud Bar. ann. 419. n. 8. [t] Pagi, crit. hist. in annal. Bar.

(A) This Letter beareth Date the First of *July* 419.

claim, nor attempt to usurp, any new Power over his Collegues; but yet he would not part with any his Predecessors enjoyed, by what means soever they had acquired it; and those who attempted to curtail the usurped Jurisdiction of the Apostolic See, met with as vigorous an Opposition from him as they could have done either from *Innocent* or *Zosimus*. In short, he had not Ambition enough to inlarge his Authority, but thought himself in Conscience obliged *to maintain the just Rights*, as he styled and believed them, *of the See in which it had pleased Divine Providence to place him, although unworthy of so great an Honour*. His Steadiness in asserting these Claims appeared chiefly in the Dispute that arose between him and the Bishops of *Illyricum*, over whom *Damasus* had usurped, as I have related elsewhere [u], and his Successors maintained, a particular Power and Jurisdiction. The Transaction is thus related by the Writers of those Times. The See of *Patræ* in *Achaia*, one of the Provinces of *Illyricum*, being vacant, the Bishop of *Corinth*, Metropolitan of that Province, did all that lay in his Power to get *Perigenes*, a Presbyter of an exceptionable Character, chosen in the room of their deceased Bishop. But his Endeavours proving unsuccessful, he returned to *Corinth*, and died soon after. Upon his Death the People and Clergy of *Corinth*, to honour his Memory, and shew the Regard they had for one whom he had favoured, unanimously named *Perigenes* to succeed him. But as they apprehended some Opposition from the Bishops of the same Province, they wrote to *Boniface*, begging him to confirm their Election with his Authority. *Boniface* referred them to *Rufus*, then Bishop of *Thessalonica*, and his Vicar in those Parts, declaring that, as for himself, he had nothing to object either against their Election, or the Person elected. *Rufus* notified to the Bishops of the Province, and the Metropolitans of the Diocese, the

Dispute between him and the Bishops of Illyricum.

[u] See p. 302, 303.

the Approbation of *Boniface*, and his own; but it was not received by all in the ſame manner. The greater Part indeed agreed to the Ordination of the new Biſhop; but ſome oppoſed it with great Warmth, prompted, moſt probably, by the Jealouſy they entertained of the growing Power of the See of *Rome*: for, at their Requeſt, a Law was publiſhed by the Emperor *Theodoſius*, dated the 14th of *July* 421, commanding all Diſputes, that ſhould ariſe in the Dioceſe of *Illyricum*, to be finally determined by the Biſhops of that Dioceſe, after they had conſulted the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* [w]. This was taking thoſe Provinces from the Biſhop of *Rome*, and, in ſome Degree, ſubjecting them to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, or, at leaſt, opening a Door for ſuch a Subjection. The Power of the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople* was already grown very conſiderable, and their Ambition keeping Pace with that of the Biſhops of *Rome*, neither let any Opportunity ſlip of extending the Juriſdiction of their own See at the Expence of the other. In the preſent Caſe the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* availing himſelf of the Favour of the Emperor, and the Diſagreement that reigned among the *Illyrican* Biſhops, ſummoned, without Loſs of Time, a Council to meet at *Corinth*, and there to examine the Ordination of *Perigenes*, although he had been ordained, and his Ordination approved of both by *Rufus* and *Boniface*. This Step, quite unexpected, alarmed *Boniface*; he diveſted himſelf at once of his pacific Diſpoſition, and, aſſuming the Air and Style of Authority, he wrote Three Letters, all dated the ſame Day, *viz.* 11th of *March* 422, encouraging the Friends of the Apoſtolic See to maintain its Rights, and threatening thoſe who dared to invade them. The Firſt was to *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*, whom he animateth not to ſuffer any Innovations, but vigorouſly to withſtand thoſe, who aſſumed an Authority that did not become them, and to which they had no kind of Title or Claim,

Law of Theodoſius concerning Diſputes that ſhould ariſe in Illyricum.

Three Letters of Boniface.

He maintains, with Authority, his pretended Rights.

[w] Cod. Theod. l. 45. de Epiſcop. l. 6.

meaning,

meaning, no doubt, the Bishop of *Constantinople*. The Second Letter he wrote to the Bishops of *Thessaly*, exhorting them to acknowlege the Authority of *Rufus*, and no other. The Third was addressed to the Bishops of *Macedon*, *Achaia*, *Thessaly*, *Epirus*, and *Dacia*, who had been summoned by the Bishop of *Constantinople* to assemble at *Corinth*, and there deliver their Opinion concerning the Ordination of *Perigenes*. In this Letter he complaineth, in the strongest Terms, of so bold and daring an Attempt, asking, in the Style of a Sovereign, *What Bishop shall presume to question an Ordination approved by us? What Bishop could take upon him to assemble a Council with that View and Intent? Read*, he addeth, *read the Canons, and there you will find, that the See of* Rome *is the First, the See of* Alexandria *the Second, and that of* Antioch *the Third. These are the Three great Sees; these the Sees which the Fathers have distinguished above the rest, with ample Privileges, and extensive Jurisdiction.* Since he refers them to the Canons to shew, that these Three Sees are superior to the See of *Constantinople*, both in Dignity and Jurisdiction, it were to be wished he had, at the same time, acquainted them by what Canons his Predecessors had exercised over the Provinces of *Illyricum* the Jurisdiction which he now so zealously asserteth. But that is more than it was in his Power to do. However, in the present Letter, he threateneth with Excommunication such of the *Illyrican* Bishops as shall, in Defiance of his Orders, comply with the Summons which they have received, or presume to question the Ordination of *Perigenes*. What was the Issue of this Dispute is not recorded by any of the Antients; but a modern Historian [x] informeth us, that the Emperor *Honorius* interposing, at the Request of *Boniface*, in Behalf of the See of *Rome*, prevailed upon *Theodosius* to revoke his former Law, and enact another in its room, confirming to the Apostolic See all its antient

[x] Fleury hist eccles. l, 24. n. 31.

tient Privileges, and injoining the *Præfectus Prætorio* to see the latter Law put in Execution. The Historian quotes this Law from the Archives of the *Roman* Church. But as it is not to be found either in the *Theodosian* or *Justinian* Code, its Authenticity may be justly suspected.

He revokes the Privileges granted by Zosimus to the Church of Arles.

The same Year 422, *Boniface* gave a signal Instance of his Equity and Love of Justice, which redoundeth greatly to his Honour, and therefore ought not to be omitted. He was sensible, that his Predecessor *Zosimus*, abusing his Authority, had acted in the Affair of the *Gallican* Bishops, in a most partial and arbitrary manner; that the See of *Arles* had no just Title to the many Privileges, which he had been induced, by his Partiality for *Patroclus*, to heap on it, at the Expence of Two other Sees; and, consequently, that it was incumbent upon himself, now that he had the Power in his Hands, to rectify, by a better Use of it, what his Predecessor had done amiss. The Love of Justice therefore prevailing in him over all other Considerations, he annulled, by a Letter addressed to *Hilarius* of *Narbonne*, whatever had been done by *Zosimus* in favour of the See of *Arles*, restored and confirmed to the Sees of *Narbonne* and *Vienne* all the Rights and Privileges, which they had been so unjustly divested of, and declaring all the Grants and Concessions made to the See of *Arles* repugnant to the Canons, strictly injoined the Bishop of *Narbonne* not to suffer his Brother of *Arles* to exercise, in virtue of them, any kind of Authority within the Limits of his Jurisdiction (A). The Conduct of *Boniface* was afterwards approved, and that of *Zosimus* justly condemned by Pope *Leo the Great*, declaring in a Letter which he wrote to the Bishops of the Province of *Vienne*, that the Privileges, which the Apostolic See had granted to *Patroclus*, were afterwards revoked *by a more equitable Sentence*.

One

(A) This Letter is dated the 2d of *February* 422.

A remarkable Instance of his Moderation.

One of the many Artifices, employed by the Popes to aggrandize their See, was to raise Divisions among their Collegues, or to foment underhand those that others had raised. For in such Divisions they never stood neuter, but, taking Part in the Quarrel, nay, and making themselves Principals, they warmly declared in favour of one Party against the other, that, by supporting them, they might be in their Turn supported by them in all their Pretensions. To this worldly Wisdom, this wicked Policy, *Boniface* was an utter Stranger: for he did not lay hold of a very favourable Opportunity, which the Division, that reigned at this Time among the Bishops of *Gaul*, offered him, to improve his Authority, and extend his Jurisdiction. The Metropolitan Dignity was disputed there by the Bishops of *Vienne*, of *Narbonne*, and of *Arles*, as I have observed above. During that Contest the Clergy of *Valence*, quarreling with their Bishop *Maximus*, charged him with several Crimes; but not caring to accuse him at the Tribunal of any of the Three Competitors (for that had been acknowleging, in one of the Three, the Metropolitan Jurisdiction then in Dispute), they arraigned him at *Rome*, and summoned him to plead his Cause there before *Boniface*. Most other Popes would have eagerly embraced such an Opportunity of inlarging their Power; nay, and founded upon this particular Case the general Right of judging, and finally determining all Causes of the like Nature. But *Boniface* declared, in his Letter to *Patroclus*, and the other Bishops of the Seven Provinces of *Gaul*, that although *Maximus* had been accused at his Tribunal, although he had not appeared to clear himself from the Crimes laid to his Charge, and might thereupon be thought guilty, and be justly condemned; yet he would not take upon him to pronounce such a Sentence, because that Bishop *ought, according to the Canons, to be judged, and condemned, or absolved, in his own Province.* An Instance of Moderation

deration that reflecteth no ſmall Honour on the Memory of *Boniface*; the rather as he had before his Eyes the recent Examples of *Innocent* and *Zoſimus*, the Two moſt ambitious and arrogant Popes the Church had yet ſeen. He cloſeth his Letter with exhorting the Biſhops of the Seven Provinces to aſſemble againſt the Firſt of *November*, that *Maximus* may be cleared, if innocent, or condemned, if guilty.

Boniface died on the 4th of *November* 422, having held the Chair Three Years, Nine Months, and ſome Days. He was buried in the Cœmetery of the Martyr St. *Felicitas*, on the *Salarian* Way; where he is ſaid to have built an Oratory. He is worſhiped by the Church of *Rome* among her Saints, an Honour which few of his Predeceſſors better deſerved. But it is a Wonder that the laſt Inſtance I have given of his Moderation, and Regard to the Canons againſt the Claims of his See, did not exclude him out of the Calendar. His Feſtival is kept on the 25th of *October*; and *Bede* quoteth a Book of Miracles wrought by Pope *Boniface* [y]; but whether by the Firſt Pope of that Name, or the Second, he doth not inform us, although he ſeemeth to give an intire Credit to every idle Tale that Legend contained. And here I cannot help obſerving, by the way, that the leſs neceſſary Miracles became, the more they were multiplied. In *Bede*'s Time, and the three preceding Centuries, Men were rather inclined to believe too much than too little; and yet in no other Time was there a greater Profuſion of Miracles. From an antient Epitaph quoted by *Baronius* [z], it appears that *Boniface* died very old; that he had ſerved the Church from his tender Years; that by his engaging Behaviour he put an End to the Schiſm, and that he relieved *Rome* in the time of a Famine.

His Death.

[y] Bed. in collectan. in fin. [z] Bar. ad ann, 423. n. 8, 9.

CELESTINE.

HONORIUS. **CELESTINE,** THEODOSIUS II. VALENTINIAN III.

Forty-second BISHOP *of* Rome.

Year of Christ 422.

UPON the Demise of *Boniface*, *Celestine* was chosen in his room, without the least Disturbance or Opposition. *Eulalius* indeed, who was still alive, and led a retired Life in the neighbouring Province of *Campania*, was tempted by his Friends in *Rome* to try his Fortune a Second Time; but he did not chuse to quit his Solitude, and involve both himself and them in new Troubles. *Celestine* was a Native of *Rome*, the Son of one *Priscus*, and a Deacon, if not a Presbyter, at the Time of his Election [a].

Celestine chosen without Opposition.

He was scarce warm in the Chair, when he received a Letter from St. *Austin* on the following Occasion. As the small Town, or rather Village, of *Fussala*, belonging to the Bishoprick of *Hippo*, the See of St. *Austin*, stood at a great Distance from that City, the good Bishop thought he could not better consult the spiritual Welfare of the Inhabitants, who had but very lately abandoned the Party of the *Donatists*, than by causing their Town to be erected into a separate Bishoprick, and letting them have a Bishop of their own. This was indeed abridging both his own Jurisdiction and Revenues; but as he had the Good of the People more at Heart than either, he pursued his Scheme with Success, and prevailed upon his Collegues in *Numidia* to ordain a young Man named *Antony*, whom he had brought up from his Infancy, the first Bishop of the Place, although at that time only a Reader. This Promotion, *per saltum*, as it is styled, was strictly forbidden by the Popes in their Decretals; but to their Orders St. *Austin* paid no greater Regard than the other Bishops did, although he always spoke of them,

Antony, one of St. Austin's Disciples, appointed by his Interest Bishop of Fussala.

[a] Vid. Noris hist. Pel. l. 2. c. 10.

them, and to them, with all the Reſpect that was due to the firſt Biſhop in the Weſt. St. *Auſtin* had ſoon Occaſion to repent his tranſgreſſing of thoſe Regulations, which, it muſt be owned, are in themſelves very wiſe: for *Antony*, who was but a Youth, and had been kept by St. *Auſtin* under great Reſtraint, no ſooner found himſelf free from all Controul, than abandoning himſelf intirely to the Indulgence of his youthful Paſſions, he thereby ſcandalized the new Catholics to ſuch a Degree, that they let St. *Auſtin* know that the Conduct of their Biſhop, unleſs he was quickly removed, would certainly drive them to the laſt Extremity; meaning, perhaps, that they ſhould be forced either to put him to Death, or to join anew the *Donatiſts*, whom they had but lately forſaken. Such Menaces alarmed St. *Auſtin* no leſs than the Conduct of his Favourite Diſciple ſurpriſed him. A Council was immediately ſummoned at his Requeſt by the Primate of *Numidia*; *Antony* was ordered to attend it, and the Inhabitants of *Fuſſala* invited to lay their Complaints before the Aſſembly. The Summons was complied with by all, and *Antony*, by a great Number of Witneſſes, convicted of Rapine, Violence, and Extortion. But, becauſe ſome capital Crimes laid to his Charge were not ſufficiently proved, the Fathers of the Council, out of an unſeaſonable Compaſſion, contented themſelves with only condemning him to reſtore to the Inhabitants of *Fuſſala* what he had with Violence taken from them. They were even inclined to leave him in the quiet Poſſeſſion of his Church; but that being warmly oppoſed by the People, they deprived him of the Adminiſtration and of all Juriſdiction; but as he ſtill retained the Epiſcopal Dignity, they did not chuſe to remove him to another City to live there even as a private Perſon, leſt they ſhould be thought to tranſgreſs the Rules of the Fathers forbidding

Antony's ſcandalous Behaviour.

He is deprived of the Adminiſtration, and all Juriſdiction, by a Council.

bidding Translations[c]. None could think so who were the least acquainted with those Rules.

He appeals to Rome.

Antony satisfied, pursuant to his Sentence, the Inhabitants of *Fussala*, whom he had wronged. But pretending that he had been unjustly deprived of his Bishoprick, he resolved to appeal to *Rome*. He was sensible that his appealing at this Juncture, when the Point of Appeals was warmly disputed, as I shall relate hereafter, was Merit enough to recommend him to the Favour of that See. However, not trusting to that alone, as *Boniface* was still alive, he first engaged in his Favour his own Primate, the Primate of *Numidia*, who, having been excused on Account of his great Age from assisting at the Council, was not well acquainted with what had passed there. Him therefore he easily persuaded, that he had been very ill used by the Council: *For had they thought me guilty*, said he, *of the Rapine and Extortions, that were laid to my Charge, they ought, and, without all doubt, would have deposed me: they have not deposed me, and therefore did not, as is manifest, think me guilty. If I did not deserve to be degraded from my Dignity, I did not deserve to be driven from my See.* Thus he artfully turned the Mercy that had been shewn him against those who had shewn it; and, having by that means imposed upon the Primate, persuaded him to write a Letter in his Behalf to *Boniface*. With this Letter he repaired to *Rome*, but did not meet there with the Reception he expected: for all he could obtain of *Boniface* was a Letter to the Bishops of *Numidia*, requiring them to reinstate him in his See, *provided he had represented Matters as they truly were.* This conditional Request *Antony*, on his Return to *Africa*, improved, it seemeth into an absolute Command: for he threatened the People of *Fussala* with a Visit from the Imperial Troops and Commissaries, if they did not receive him, as their lawful Bishop, in compliance with the Orders of the Apostolic

Prevails upon the Primate to write in his Behalf to Rome.

How received by Boniface.

[c] Aug. ep. 261. de civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 8.

Apoſtolic See [d]. In the mean time *Boniface* dying, and *Celeſtine* being choſen in his room, the People of *Fuſſala* apprehending, as St. *Auſtin* writeth, greater Evils from a Catholic Biſhop, after their Return to the Church, than they had from a Catholic Emperor during their Separation, wrote a moſt pathetic Letter to the new Pope, intreating him to pity their Condition, to curb *Antony* in his unchriſtian Attempts, and to redeem them, by his Authority, from the Calamities which they had Reaſon to apprehend from that Prelate's Cruelty and Ambition. In the ſame Letter they imputed all their Misfortunes to *Auſtin*, who had ſet over them ſuch a Biſhop. And this *Auſtin* was ſo far from taking amiſs, that he owned the Charge, and even backed their Requeſt with a Letter of his own, conjuring *Celeſtine*, by the Memory of St. *Peter*, *who abhorred all Violence and Tyranny*, not to uſe either with the People of *Fuſſala*, who, he ſaid, had but too much Reaſon not to ſubmit tamely to the galling Yoke from which they had been ſo lately delivered. He adds, that if, in ſpite of all his Endeavours and Remonſtrances, he ſhould ſtill have the Mortification to ſee the Church of *Fuſſala* plundered and tyrannically oppreſſed by one whom he had raiſed to that See, he ſhould think himſelf obliged to atone for the Share which he had in his Crimes, by reſigning his own [e]. *Celeſtine* was ſo affected with theſe Letters, that he immediately acquieſced to the Sentence of the Council of *Numidia*; and the new Biſhoprick of *Fuſſala* being ſuppreſſed, that Town, with its Diſtrict, was again ſubjected to the See of *Hippo*. From theſe Letters, that were written by the *Africans* on this Occaſion, it appears, that the Biſhops of *Rome* uſed, in thoſe Days, to ſend ſome of their Eccleſiaſtics into *Africa*, to ſee the Sentences, which they had given, executed there; and that thoſe Eccleſiaſtics came with Orders from the Court for the Civil Magiſtrates to aſſiſt

The People of Fuſſala write againſt him to Innocent.

Are ſeconded by St. Auſtin.

Celeſtine *acquieſces to the Sentence of the Council of* Numidia.

[d] Aug. ep. 261. [e] Aug. ibid.

assist them, where their Assistance should be required, or thought necessary.

An End put to the Schism formed by Eulalius.

The Schism formed by *Eulalius* was not, it seemeth, yet quite extinct in *Rome* in the Year 425. for I find a Law of that Year, dated the 17th of *July*, and addressed to *Faustus* Prefect of the City, commanding all *Manichees*, Heretics, Schismatics, and Sects of every Denomination, to be driven out of *Rome*; but more especially those, who, separating themselves from the Communion of the *Venerable Pope*, kept alive a dangerous Schism. Over these *Faustus* is injoined to keep a watchful Eye, to summon them to communicate with *Celestine*, and, if they did not comply with the Summons in Twenty Days, to banish them an Hundred Miles from *Rome*[f]. This Law was issued by *Placidia*, who, upon the Death of her Brother *Honorius*, which happened in the Month of *August* 423. and that of the Usurper *John*, killed in 425. governed the Western Empire, as Guardian to her Son *Valentinian* III. The Law she issued probably put an End to the Schism; for no further mention is made of it by any Historian.

It was in the Time of *Celestine*, and the following Year 426. the Fourth of his Pontificate, that the Bishops of *Africa*, quite tired out with the daily Encroachments of the Bishops of *Rome*, and not able to brook the despotic and arbitrary Power which they had begun to exercise over them, took the no less laudable than necessary Resolution of breaking their Chains before they were thoroughly riveted, and asserting their antient Liberty, by effectually removing what had endangered it, the pernicious Abuse of appealing to *Rome*. The Incident which gave Occasion to that Resolution was, the Appeal of a Presbyter of *Sicca*, named *Apiarius*, who, being convicted of many Crimes, and thereupon degraded and excommunicated by his own Bishop *Urbanus*, appealed to *Zosimus* then Bishop of *Rome*. *Zosimus*, who

Apiarius, a Presbyter of Sicca, appeals to Rome.

[f] Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 184.

who miſſed no Opportunity of acquiring new Power, or improving the Power which he had acquired, not only received the Appeal, but, without ever hearing the other Side, reſtored *Apiarius* both to his Rank, and the Communion of the Church. This was the boldeſt Attempt that had yet been made upon the Rights and Liberties of the *African* Churches; and therefore the Biſhops in thoſe Parts, all uniting in a Cauſe that was common to all, loudly complained of ſuch an arbitrary Act, as an open Violation of the Canons of the Church; forbidding thoſe, who had been excluded from the Communion by their own Biſhop, to be admitted to it by any other[g]. *Zoſimus*, finding the *African* Biſhops had taken the Alarm, and were determined to reſtrain his Power within the Limits preſcribed to it by the Canons, and, on the other hand, being well appriſed, that he could allege no Canons, that had ever been received by them, to countenance the Power which he claimed, and had exerciſed, thought it would be no great Crime to recur to Fraud on ſo urgent an Occaſion. Agreeably to this Scheme, he cauſed Two Canons to be tranſcribed from the Council of *Sardica*; the one allowing Preſbyters and Deacons, when raſhly excommunicated by their own Biſhops, to appeal to the neighbouring Biſhops; and the other, authorizing the Appeal of all Biſhops to the Biſhop of *Rome*. Had the *Africans* received theſe Canons, he intended to have juſtified, by the former, his judging and abſolving of *Apiarius*, notwithſtanding the Diſtance between *Rome* and *Numidia*; and, in virtue of the latter, to get the Canon revoked, which the *African* Biſhops had lately made, forbidding, on Pain of Excommunication, Appeals *beyond Sea*; that is, to *Rome*. Nothing leſs than an intire Subjection of the *African* Churches to the See of *Rome* would ſatisfy the boundleſs Ambition of *Zoſimus*, and ſuch a Subjection would infallibly have enſued, had the Two above-mentioned Canons been received by the *African* Biſhops in the Senſe which

Zoſimus reſtores him to the Rank from which he had been degraded.

To ſupport his Pretenſions, endeavours to impoſe upon the African *Biſhops the Canons of* Sardica *for the Canons of* Nice.

[g] Concil. t. 2. p. 1048. Bar. ad ann. 419. n. 60.

Zosimus did, and seemed determined to make others, put upon them. But the main Point was, to persuade the Bishops of *Africa* to admit such Canons, especially at so critical a Juncture. The Council of *Sardica* had never been received there: nay, they were, it seemeth, at this very Time, utter Strangers both to that Council and its Canons; so that it was useless to quote them as such. Of this *Zosimus* was aware; and therefore, as he stuck at nothing that stood in the way of his Ambition, he resolved, by one of the most impudent and bare-faced Impostures recorded in History, to try whether he could not impose upon the Bishops of *Africa* the Canons of *Sardica* for the Canons of *Nice*. With this knavish View, and to render the Imposture more solemn, and less suspected, he dispatched into *Africa* Three Legates, *viz. Faustinus* Bishop of *Potentia* in *Picenum*, and Two *Roman* Presbyters, *Philippus* and *Asellus*. Their Instructions, contained in a Letter addressed to themselves, were, to require of the *African* Bishops a strict Observance of the Two above-mentioned Canons of *Nice*; to complain of their repairing so often to Court; and to desire them not to communicate with *Urbanus* of *Sicca*, who had deposed *Apiarius*, or even to send him to *Rome*, if he refused to correct what he had done amiss [h]: that is, we may suppose, if he did not restore *Apiarius* to his Rank, and the Communion of the Church.

With this View he sends a solemn Embassy into Africa.

With these Instructions the Legates set out for *Africa*, where they no sooner arrived, than a Council was convened, at which assisted, among the rest, *Alypius* Bishop of *Tagaste*, St. *Austin*'s great Friend, and *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*. When the Legates first appeared before the Council, the Bishops desired them to lay their Instructions before the Assembly; which they were at first unwilling to do, contenting themselves with declaring their Commission by Word of Mouth. But the *Africans* knowing whom they had to deal with, and thereupon pressing them to commu-

[h] Concil. t. 2. p. 1137---1144.

communicate their Inſtructions in Writing, they complied at laſt, and produced the Letter I have mentioned above, which was immediately regiſtered. When it was publicly read, it is impoſſible to conceive the Surprize and Aſtoniſhment that appeared in the whole Aſſembly. They had never heard of thoſe Canons; and to find them thus confidently aſcribed to the Council of *Nice*, was what appeared to them ſtrange beyond Expreſſion. Warm Diſputes aroſe, of which, however, we know no Particulars. Several different *Greek* Copies, ſeveral *Latin* Copies, were ſent for, and carefully examined and compared; but no ſuch Canons could be found there. However, as the Legates continued to maintain, with an unparalleled Impudence, the diſputed Canons of *Nice*, the Council agreed to obſerve them, until they had, by a more diligent Inquiry, diſcovered the Truth[i].

The Surprize of the African Biſhops on this Occaſion.

They continued their Seſſions; but as they were few in Number, as the Point in Diſpute was of the utmoſt Conſequence, and nearly affected all the Biſhops of *Africa*, they thought it ſhould be communicated to all; and that, without the Concurrence of all, no Reſolution ſhould be taken. A General Council was accordingly aſſembled at *Carthage*, conſiſting of Two hundred and Seventeen Biſhops, from the different Provinces of *Africa*. They met, for the firſt time, on the 25th of *May* 419. *Fauſtinus* being placed next after *Aurelius* of *Carthage* and *Valentine* Primate of *Numidia*, and the Two Preſbyters *Philippus* and *Aſellus* after the other Biſhops. Being all ſeated, *Aurelius* moved, that the Canons of *Nice* might be read, from the Copies which they had of that Council in *Africa*. But this was warmly oppoſed by *Fauſtinus*, inſiſting upon their reading, in the firſt place, his Inſtructions, and coming to ſome Reſolution concerning the Obſervance of the Canons of *Nice*, which he was charged by the Apoſtolic See to require of them. *It matters not*, ſaid he, *whether or no thoſe Canons are to be found in your Copies*,

A General Council aſſembled at Carthage.

The Conduct of Fauſtinus, the Pope's Legate on this Occaſion.

[i] Concil. t. 2. p. 1144---1148.

pies, or, indeed, in any other. You must know, that the Canons and Ordinances of Nice, *which have been handed down to us by Tradition, and established by Custom, are no less binding than those that have been conveyed to us in Writing.* To this Speech, the Bishops returned no Answer; without doubt, because they thought it deserved none. However, at his Request, his Instructions were read, and warm Debates ensued. *Alypius* was of Opinion, that since the disputed Canons were not to be found in any other Copies, Messengers and Letters should be immediately dispatched to the Bishops of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, for authentic Copies of the Acts and Canons of *Nice*. This Proposal *Faustinus* highly resented, as an Outrage offered to the Apostolic See, which, he said, was thereby arraigned of Fraud and Forgery. He therefore advised them to write to *Boniface*, who, by this time, had succeeded *Zosimus*, and, leaving to him the Care of examining the Authority of those Canons, submit the Whole to his Judgment, to his known Prudence and Discretion. He added, that, by acting otherwise, they might give Occasion to great Divisions and Disturbances in the Church. *Aurelius*, not to exasperate the Legate, whom he found to be a Man of an haughty, imperious, and intractable Temper, made no other Reply, but *that they would write to* Boniface. St. *Austin* promised to observe those Canons so long as it could be reasonably supposed that they were the Canons of *Nice*. The other Bishops made the same Promise; which was confirming the Resolution the Counil had taken the Year before. Here the Legate exaggerated anew the Affront they offered to the *Roman* Church; adding, that the only Reparation they could make, for questioning the Authenticity of Canons proposed by her, was, to leave the deciding of that Point to her, and acquiesce to her Judgment. But the Warmth, the Earnestness, the Passion which he betrayed in his Speech, and in his whole Conduct, served only to heighten

The Resolution taken by the Council.

heighten the Jealouſy, and confirm the Suſpicions of the *African* Biſhops. It was therefore univerſally agreed, in ſpite of the Remonſtrances, Intreaties, and Menaces of the Legate, that *Aurelius* ſhould write to the Biſhops of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, for authentic Copies of the Canons of *Nice*; that if the Canons, quoted by *Fauſtinus*, were found in thoſe Copies, they ſhould be punctually obſerved; if not, that a new Council ſhould be convened, and ſuch Reſolutions taken, as the Fathers, who compoſed it, ſhould think proper [k].

The Affair of Apiarius, *how ſettled by the Council.*

Matters being thus ſettled, with reſpect to the pretended Canons of *Nice*, concerning Appeals, the Council took next into Conſideration the Caſe of *Apiarius*, which had given Occaſion to the preſent Diſpute between *Rome* and *Africa*; and it was agreed, that *Apiarius* ſhould make the due Submiſſion to his Biſhop, and thereupon be re-admitted to his Communion, and reſtored to his Rank. However, as he had given great Offence to the People of *Sicca*, by his ſcandalous Life, he was ordered, by the Council, to quit that City; but, at the ſame time, allowed to exerciſe the Functions of his Office in any other Place [l]. This Medium the Council wiſely choſe between the Two oppoſite Sentences; that of *Urbanus* excommunicating and depoſing him, and that of *Zoſimus* reſtoring him to the Communion and the Prieſthood. Such was the Iſſue of the Appeal of *Apiarius*: and I leave the Reader to judge, whether *Baronius* ſhould boaſt of it as he doth. And now nothing remained, but to acquaint *Boniface* with the Acts and Reſolutions of the Council; and this was done accordingly by a Letter, which they all ſigned, and delivered to the Legates. In that Letter they begged *Boniface* to procure, from the Eaſt, authentic Copies of the Canons of *Nice*, promiſing to obſerve the Canons in Diſpute, until ſuch Copies were procured; but this upon Condition, that if thoſe

[k] Conc. t. 2. p. 1145---1149. [l] Ibid. p. 1137---1145.

those Canons were not found to be genuine, they should recover their antient Privileges, and not be forced to *submit to a Yoke, which Ambition alone could impose* [m].

The African *Bishops write into the East for authentic Copies of the Council of* Nice.

With this Letter the Three Legates set out from *Africa*, on their Return to *Rome*. Upon their departure, the *African* Bishops wrote, agreeably to the Resolution they had taken, to *Atticus* of *Constantinople* and *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, begging they would cause to be transcribed, and send into *Africa*, the most authentic Copies they had of the Canons of *Nice*. With this Request the Two Bishops readily complied; and the same Year 419, the Messengers sent to *Alexandria* and *Constantinople* returned with the wished-for Copies, and very friendly and obliging Answers, which are still extant [n], from *Cyril* and *Atticus*, addressed *To* Aurelius, *to* Valentine, *and to all the Bishops of* Africa *assembled at* Carthage. As for the Bishop of *Antioch*, the *Africans* probably did not write to him; at least, they had no Answer from him (A). They immediately compared the Two Copies, sent them from the East, with their own, especially with that which *Cæcilianus* of *Carthage* had brought with him from *Nice*, where he had assisted at the Council, and found them agree in every Particular, without any Trace of the Canons that *Zosimus* had produced: upon which they dispatched the same Ecclesiastics with them to *Rome*, whom they had sent into the East. *Boniface*, who was an Enemy to all Fraud and Imposition, acquiesced; the Dispute was dropped; so that the Canon, which the *African* Bishops had lately made, forbidding Appeals to *Rome*, and *Zosimus* had thus fraudulently

The pretended Canons not found in those Copies, and the Dispute dropt by Boniface.

[m] Concil. ibid. p. 1137---1141. [n] Concil. t. 2. p. 1144.

(A) It is very observable, that the *Alexandrian* Copy was originally sent from *Rome* by *Marcus* Bishop of that City, upon a Complaint made by the *Egyptian* Bishops, that the *Arians* had burnt all the Copies of the Council of *Nice* that were then found in *Alexandria*.

fraudulently attempted to defeat, remained in its full Vigour; and the Churches of *Africa* were ſuffered quietly to enjoy their antient Rights and Privileges, ſo long as *Boniface* lived. But in the Pontificate of his Succeſſor *Celeſtine*, the Storm broke out anew.

The Power of receiving Appeals claimed by the Popes only as granted by the Canons.

It may not be improper here to obſerve, that *Zoſimus*, although wholly bent on exalting his See, and ſtraining every Prerogative to the higheſt Pitch, yet did not preſume to exalt it above the Canons; did not claim the diſputed Power of receiving Appeals, of judging, deciding, *&c.* independently of the Canons. And was not this owning himſelf, but for the Canons, to be upon the Level with the other Biſhops his Collegues; at leaſt in reſpect to this Point? Is not the ſcandalous Method, which he took on this Occaſion to extend his own Power, and curtail that of the *African* Biſhops, a Demonſtration of his deriving his Claim from the Canons alone? Could there ever offer a better Opportunity, could there ever occur a more urgent Neceſſity, of aſſerting a *Divine Right?* As *Zoſimus* therefore never aſſerted, nor even mentioned, ſuch a Right, we may well conclude, that he either had no Notion of it, or did not think it ſufficiently grounded to be of any Uſe in the preſent Diſpute. And yet this *Divine Right* of receiving Appeals from all Parts of the World, of conſtituting, confirming, judging, cenſuring, ſuſpending, depoſing, removing, reſtoring Biſhops, and all other Eccleſiaſtics, is now held, as an Article of Faith, by all true *Roman* Catholics; inſomuch that to diſpute ſuch an Article, would be no leſs dangerous, in Countries where the Inquiſition prevaileth, than to diſpute any Article of the *Apoſtolic* or *Nicene* Creed. It is true, *Innocent* the Firſt, as the Advocates for the See of *Rome* obſerve, had claimed, by *Divine Right*, the Power of finally deciding Controverſies. But he himſelf ſeemeth to have been ſenſible, that he had gone too far. For what elſe could

could have induced him to restrain that Claim, as soon as he had set it up, to *Matters of Faith alone* o? Had *Zosimus* thought the general Claim capable of being maintained, he needed not have recurred, as he did, to Fraud and Imposture. The Pretensions of *Innocent*, in their utmost Extent, were indeed renewed, in Process of Time, by his Successors; but not until the intolerable Abuse, which they made of the Power granted them by the Canons of *Sardica*, on which they founded all their Usurpations, obliged other Councils to revoke those Canons; and then it was, that, no other Means being left of maintaining their ill-gotten Power, they revived the Claim of *Innocent*, and challenging no longer by the Canons, but by *Divine Right*, the Prerogative of receiving Appeals, they put it out of the Power of all future Councils to abridge or restrain it.

Whether Zosimus ignorantly mistook the Canons of Sardica *for those of* Nice.

The Three Cardinals *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and *Noris*, thinking the Imputation of Ignorance less injurious to the Memory of *Zosimus*, less derogatory to the Dignity of the Apostolic See, than that of Fraud and Imposture, suppose him to have ignorantly mistaken the Canons of *Sardica* for the Canons of *Nice*; which is supposing, that in the whole Archives of the *Roman* Church there was not a single genuine Copy of the Council of *Nice*, or that *Zosimus* had never perused it; and to suppose either is highly absurd. Besides, the whole Conduct of the Legate, the Pains he took to divert the *African* Bishops from consulting other Copies, and, when he could not prevail, his recurring to *unwritten* Canons; and, as that too proved ineffectual, his striving by all possible means to persuade the *Africans* to leave to the Pope the Care of examining other Copies, and to acquiesce, without any further Inquiry, to what should thereupon be determined by him, plainly shews, that the Legate was privy to the Fraud, and apprehended a Detection.

Apiarius

o See p. 342.

Apiarius, being obliged to quit *Sicca*, as I have related above, retired to *Tabraca*, another City of *Numidia*, and led there ſo ſcandalous a Life, that he was excommunicated anew. Hereupon he appealed again to *Rome*, and *Celeſtine*, which is very ſurpriſing, notwithſtanding the vigorous Oppoſition which his Predeceſſors had, but very lately, met with from the *African* Biſhops, in attempting to reſtore this very Preſbyter, not only declared him innocent, and admitted him to his Communion, but ſent him back into *Africa*, attended by the Legate *Fauſtinus*, who was ordered to ſee him reinſtated. The *Africans* were but too well acquainted already with the Preſumption and Arrogance of the Biſhops of *Rome*; and yet ſuch an inſolent Act quite ſurpriſed them. For *Celeſtine* had neither examined the Crimes, which *Apiarius* was charged with, nor heard the Witneſſes, nor even condeſcended to let them know, that he intended to judge him anew. He wrote, indeed, Two Letters to them on this Occaſion, but which ſeemed merely deſigned to inſult them: for, by the Firſt, he gave them Notice of the Arrival of *Apiarius* at *Rome*, which, he ſaid, had given him great Joy; and by the Second, which was brought by *Fauſtinus*, he acquainted them, that he was overjoyed to have found him innocent. From this deſpotic and extraordinary way of acting, the *African* Biſhops concluded, that *Celeſtine* was determined to keep no Meaſures with them, and that nothing leſs than an intire Subjection of the *African* Churches to the See of *Rome* would ſatisfy his Ambition. But they were reſolved to maintain, at all Events, the Liberty wherewith Chriſt had made them free. A general Council was therefore aſſembled, and *Apiarius* ſummoned to attend. He obeyed the Summons, and appeared before the Council at the Time appointed, but, in Company with *Fauſtinus*, ſhewing thereby, that he placed greater Confidence in him than in his own Innocence. *Fauſtinus* ſpoke firſt, and

Apiarius *excommunicated anew.*

He appeals anew to Rome, *and is reſtored by* Celeſtine, *and ſent back attended by the Legate* Fauſtinus.

A general Council *aſſembled.*

and pressed, with great Warmth, the Fathers of the Assembly to re-admit *Apiarius* to their Communion, since he had been declared innocent by the Apostolic See, and admitted by *Celestine* to the Communion of the *Roman* Church. The Bishops replied, that in *Africa Apiarius* had been found guilty, and that in *Africa* his Innocence must be made to appear, before they could receive him again to their Communion. As they stuck to this Point, *Faustinus* undertook his Cause; but, instead of proving, as he had promised to do, or even attempting to prove, his Innocence, he inveighed, from the Beginning of his Speech to the End, and in very harsh and opprobrious Language, against the Council, and all the Members who composed it. *Apiarius* was sensible, that the Speech of *Faustinus*, instead of reconciling the *African* Bishops to him, had incensed them more than ever against him; and therefore thinking it adviseable to take the Cause into his own Hands, he stood up as soon as the other had done; and, with a Modesty capable, as he thought, of atoning for the Insolence of *Faustinus*, endeavoured to clear himself from the Crimes that had been laid to his Charge. When he had spoken, the Witnesses against him were heard; and the Trial lasted Three whole Days, *Apiarius* striving, with great Art and Subtilty, to invalidate the Depositions, and *Faustinus* prompting him when he was at a Stand. He might, perhaps, have escaped Condemnation, partly by his own Craft and Address, partly by the powerful Protection of the Bishop of *Rome*, had he been able to withstand the Stings of his own Conscience. But, on the Fourth Day, when *Faustinus* began to triumph as sure of Victory, *Apiarius*, struck with sudden Remorse, damped at once all his Joy, by voluntarily owning, to the great Surprize of all present, and the unspeakable Confusion of *Faustinus*, every Crime with which he had been charged. Those Crimes the Fathers have thought fit to wrap up in Oblivion; and indeed it

Apiarius appears before it with Faustinus.

The Legate's insolent Conduct.

Apiarius pleads his own Cause.

Faustinus assists him.

Apiarius, struck with sudden Remorse, owns the Crimes laid to his Charge.

it was not proper that Poſterity ſhould know them; ſince they were *heinous, incredible, ſuch as ought not to be mentioned, and drew Sighs and Tears from the whole Aſſembly* P. And this is the Man whom Two Popes, both now worſhiped as Saints in the Church of *Rome*, abſolved as innocent; and, as innocent, would have ſupported with Force and Violence, had not Providence almoſt miraculouſly interpoſed, to prevent the Evils that would have enſued. They could not but know, that *Apiarius* was guilty, at leaſt they did not know that he was innocent. But as he had been declared guilty in *Africa*, their declaring him innocent, whether he was ſo or not, gave them an Opportunity of renewing the Attempts of the Apoſtolic See on the Liberties of the *African* Churches; and it was, no doubt, with this View that they abſolved and reſtored him. But, as he was not hardened enough in Iniquity for their Purpoſe, he owned himſelf guilty, in ſpite of their Judgment declaring him innocent, and thereby defeated their Schemes for the preſent. For the *Africans*, now ſenſible that there was no Wickedneſs which the Biſhops of *Rome* would not countenance, in order to eſtabliſh their Power in *Africa*, to the utter Subverſion of all Eccleſiaſtical Order and Diſcipline there, thought themſelves bound, as they tendered the Welfare, Peace, and Tranquillity of the Churches committed to their Care, to act with that Vigour and Steadineſs, which ſo urgent an Occaſion ſeemed to require. Accordingly they firſt abſolutely cut off *Apiarius* from the Communion of the Church; then renewed, in ſtronger Terms than ever, the Canon, which had given ſo great Offence at *Rome*, prohibiting, on Pain of Excommunication, Appeals *beyond Sea*, under any Pretence whatſoever; and this Prohibition they extended to Eccleſiaſtics of all Conditions and Ranks. *Fauſtinus* bluſtered, vapoured, threatened; but all in vain. The Biſhops not only ſigned,

The African *Biſhops renew the Canon, forbidding Appeals to* Rome.

P Concil. t. 2. p. 1145---1948.

ed, all to a Man, the above-mentioned Canon, but wrote a Synodal Letter to *Celestine*, acquainting him with what had passed in the Case of *Apiarius*, and earnestly intreating him not to give Ear for the future to those, who should have recourse to him from *Africa*, nor receive to his Communion such as they had excluded from theirs: *For we must let your Venerableness* (Venerabilitas tua) *know*, say they, *that it hath been so established by the Council of* Nice. *And although mention is there made of Clerks only, and Laymen; yet there is no room to doubt but it was their Intention, that such a Regulation should extend to Bishops too; and it would be a great Irregularity, should your Holiness* (a Title then common to all Bishops) *over-hastily and unduly admit to your Communion Bishops, who have been excommunicated in their own Provinces. Your Holiness therefore must not receive the Presbyters, and other Clerks, who, to avoid the Punishment, which they deserve, recur to you; the rather, as we know of no Constitutions thus derogatory to the Authority of our Churches; and the Council of* Nice *hath subjected the Bishops themselves to the Judgment of their Metropolitan. The Fathers of that Council have decreed, with great Wisdom and Equity, that all Disputes should be finally determined in the Places where they began, being sensible, that the Grace of the Holy Spirit, necessary for judging rightly, would not be wanting in any Province. Especially as every Man, who thinketh himself injured, may apply for Redress, if he pleaseth, to the Synod of his own Province, or to a national Council. Would it not be Presumption in any of us to suppose or imagine, that God will inspire a particular Person with the Spirit of Justice, and refuse it to many Bishops assembled in Council? And how can a Judgment, given out of the Country, and beyond Sea, be right, where the necessary Witnesses cannot be present, by reason of their Sex, of their Age, or of some other Impediment? As for your sending Legates, we find no such Ordinance in any Council, nor in the Writings of the Fathers. As for what you have sent us by our Collegue*

Their Letter to Celestine.

Collegue Fauſtinus, *as a Canon of the Council of* Nice, *we muſt let you know, that no ſuch Canon is to be found in the genuine and uncorrupt Copies of that Council, which have been tranſcribed and ſent us by our Fellow-Biſhop* Cyril *of* Alexandria, *and the Reverend* Atticus *of* Conſtantinople. *Thoſe Copies we ſent to* Boniface, *your Predeceſſor of worthy Memory. We therefore earneſtly beg you would ſend no more Legates, nor Eccleſiaſtics, to execute your Judgments here, leſt you ſhould ſeem to introduce worldly Pride and Arrogance* (typhum ſæculi) *into the Church of Chriſt.* They conclude with intreating him not to ſuffer *Fauſtinus* to continue any longer among them q. *Celeſtine*, finding the Spirit with which they acted, and ſenſible that it would be uſeleſs to employ Force at this Juncture, thought it adviſeable to acquieſce for the preſent, and wait until a more favourable Opportunity ſhould offer for him, or his Succeſſors, to renew the Attempt (A).

The

q Concil. t 2. p. 1148, 1149.

(A) *Schelſtrate* would make us believe, that *Gregory the Great* prevailed upon the *African* Biſhops to revoke the Canon forbidding the Preſbyters and inferior Clergy to appeal to *Rome* (1); and *Davidius*, That the *Africans* changed their Minds with reſpect to the Appeals of Biſhops, as ſoon as they were informed, that ſuch Appeals had been allowed, and approved of, by the Council of *Sardica* (2). But neither alledgeth any ſolid Reaſon, or even Conjecture, to prove Facts of ſuch Importance, nay, what *Davidius* advanceth is certainly falſe, ſince the Canons, forbidding all Appeals to *Rome*, made at this time, were ſtill quoted among the other Canons of the *African Collection* in 825, and confirmed by a Council held at *Carthage* that Year (3). Some pretend that *Celeſtine* ſeparated himſelf on this Occaſion from the *African* Biſhops, and that this Separation continued between their Churches, and that of *Rome*, until the Beginning of the VIIth Century, when *Eulalius* of *Carthage*, and his Collegues, deſireous of putting an End to the Schiſm, revoked all the Canons that had been made in 426, derogatory to the Rights of the *Roman* See (4). This they advance upon the Authority of a Piece commonly aſcribed to Pope *Boniface* II. But that Piece is ſo evidently ſuppoſititious, that *Baronius* himſelf is forced to give it up.

(1) Schel. Eccleſ. Afric. p. 50. Dav. jugemens Canoniques des Eveſques, p. 663, 664.
(2) Concil. t. 4. p. 1636.
(3) Van Eſpen. in Can. p. 216.

Celeſtius *declares Tranſlations lawful.*

The following Year 427. *Siſinius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* being dead, the Biſhops in thoſe Parts were for appointing *Proculus* in his room. But, as *Proculus* had been ordained before, although never inſtalled Biſhop of *Cyzicus*, they were under ſome Apprehenſion, leſt his Promotion to the See of *Conſtantinople* ſhould be deemed a Breach of the *Canons*, forbidding Tranſlations. But *Celeſtine*, whom they conſulted on this Occaſion, delivered them from that Apprehenſion, declaring, in a Letter, which he wrote at this time to *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, *John* of *Antioch*, and *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*, that they might ſafely place on one See a Biſhop named to another, nay, and a Biſhop who actually governed another[r]; that is, he declared Tranſlations lawful (B).

The

[r] Soc. l. 7. c. 29.

(B) Againſt Tranſlations there may be Reaſons in Policy; but there can be none in Conſcience; and none that are at all to the Purpoſe, have been alleged either by the Councils or Fathers, although the former have exerted all their Authority to prevent them, and the latter all their Oratory to make them appear criminal. The Councils of *Arles*, of *Nice*, of *Alexandria*, of *Sardica*, of *Chalcedon*, of *Antioch*, forbid them on the ſevereſt Penalties the Church could inflict. The Council of *Sardica* by its Firſt Canon deprived ſuch Biſhops, as ſhould change their Churches, even of the Lay-Communion; and becauſe ſome pleaded, or at leaſt the Council apprehended they might plead, the Deſire and Requeſt of the People; to leave no room for ſuch an Excuſe, the Council by its Second Canon, deprived thoſe, who ſhould allege it, of the Lay-Communion, even at the Point of Death (1). The Council of *Alexandria*, under St. *Athanaſius*, in their Epiſtle to all the Catholic Biſhops, ſpeak thus of *Euſebius*, who had been tranſlated from *Berytus* to *Nicomedia*: Euſebius *did not reflect on the Admonition of the Apoſtle, Art thou bound to a Wife? Do not ſeek to be looſed. For if it be ſaid of a Woman, how much more of a Church? To which if one is tied, he ought not to ſeek another; that he may not be likewiſe found an Adulterer, according to the Scripture* (2). What Analogy between a Wife, and a Biſhoprick? The Biſhops of that Aſſembly were even of Opinion, that *Euſebius*, by abandoning his former Church, had annulled his Epiſcopacy. In the Synod under *Mennas* it was laid to the Charge of *Anthimus*, that, being Biſhop of *Trebiſond*, he had *adulterouſly* ſeized

(1) Concil. t. 2. p. 628. (2) Syn. Alex. apud Athan. apol. 2.

The ſame Year *Celeſtine* wrote to *Perigenes* of *Corinth*, *Donatus* of *Nicopolis* in *Epirus*, and *Baſil* of *Lariſſa* ſeized on the See of *Conſtantinople* (3). In the ſame Strain have the Fathers declaimed againſt Tranſlations, whenever an Opportunity offered of bringing in that favourite Topic; for the Canons and Deciſions of the Councils were only the private Opinions of the major Part of the Biſhops, who compoſed them. They generally inveigh againſt that *adulterous Traffic*, as if they ſuppoſed a Biſhop to be married to the Church, which he was ordained to ſerve, or tied to it by Bonds no leſs indiſſoluble than a Huſband to his Wife: And it was upon that Suppoſition, that they charged with Adultery thoſe, who paſſed from one Church to another. But that Suppoſition none of them have been able to make good either from Scripture or Reaſon. As for the Command of the Apoſtle in his Letter to *Timothy*, *a Biſhop muſt be the Huſband of one Wife*, which ſome of them have interpreted as levelled againſt Tranſlations; the far greater Part both of the Fathers and Councils have in that Paſſage underſtood the Word *Wife*, not in a metaphorical, but a natural, Senſe, and thereupon excluded from the Epiſcopal Dignity ſuch as had been twice married. But allowing St. *Paul* to have meant a *Church* by the Word *Wife*, the moſt obvious and natural Interpretation we can give to his Words is, that he there forbiddeth Pluralities of Biſhopricks, which were once very common in the Church of *Rome*.

His Letter to the Metropolitans of Illyricum.

But whatever Reaſons the Fathers and Councils may have alleged, or could allege, againſt Tranſlations, they have themſelves defeated them all by the contrary Practice. For ſome of the greateſt Saints, and Lights of the Church have been either tranſlated, or approved and promoted the Tranſlations of others. The famous *Methodius*, who ſuffered under *Dioclefian* in the Year 311, or 312, paſſed from the See of *Olympus* in *Lycia* to that of *Tyre* (4). *Euſtathius*, who is ſuppoſed to have preſided at the Council of *Nice*, was tranſlated from *Beræa* to *Antioch*, that is, from a ſmall See to the ſecond in the Eaſt (5); nay *Sozomen* aſcribes this Tranſlation to the Council of *Nice* itſelf (6). *Syderius*, Biſhop of *Erythra* in *Libya*, was tranſlated by *Athanaſius* to *Ptolemais*, the Metropolis of the whole *Pentapolis* (7). *Euphronius* Biſhop of *Colonia*, a ſmall Town on the Borders of *Armenia*, was by a Synod, conſiſting of all the Orthodox Biſhops of that Province, tranſlated to the Metropolitan See of *Nicopolis*; that Tranſlation was highly applauded by St. *Baſil*, who thought it owing not to human Prudence, but to a particular Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt (8); the *Arians* being very powerful in that City, and no Man more fit to make head againſt them than *Euphronius*.

(3) Concil. ſub. Menn. p. 9. (4) Hier. vir. ill. c. 83. Socr. l. 6. c. 13. (5) Theod. l. 1. c. 6. Theoph. Eutych. & alii. (9) Soz. l. 1. c. 2. (7) Syneſ. ep. 67. (8) Baſil. ep. 292.

Lariſſa in *Theſſaly*, all Three Metropolitans of *Illyricum*, recommending to them an intire Submiſſion to the

The Inhabitants of *Colonia* were very unwilling to part with their Biſhop; and the Eccleſiaſtics there even threatened to join the *Arian* Party, if *Euphronius* was taken from them (9). But they were in the End prevailed upon by St. *Baſil* to acquieſce to the Will of God, who, ſaid he, had inſpired the Prelates with ſuch a Reſolution (10). From theſe (and many other Inſtances might be alleged) it is manifeſt, that the Fathers ſpoke like mere Declaimers, when they compared a Biſhop, who left one Church, and took another, to a Huſband, who abandoned his Wife, and married another Woman. But indeed they only inveighed thus, generally ſpeaking, againſt Tranſlations, when the Perſons tranſlated were of the Party, which they oppoſed; it was then Adultery, it was forfeiting the Epiſcopal Dignity, to paſs from one Church to another. But when they apprehended, that ſuch Changes could any-ways promote the Cauſe which they had eſpouſed and maintained, thoſe Changes were thereby ſanctified, and owing to a particular Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt.

Pope *Gelaſius* II. excuſed Tranſlations by the Example of St. *Peter*, *Who dareth to maintain*, ſayeth he, *that St.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apoſtles, was to blame, for changing the See of* Antioch *for that of* Rome (11)? And who dareth to maintain, that any Biſhop is to blame for doing what the Prince of the Apoſtles had done before him? But were there no other Inſtances, beſides that of St. *Peter*, to give a Sanction to Tranſlations, I ſhould readily grant them never to have been allowed in the Church. For St. *Peter* never was Biſhop of *Rome*, as I have ſhewn already (12); and ſome of the Reaſons, proving him never to have been Biſhop of *Rome*, make equally againſt his pretended Epiſcopacy of *Antioch*; but St. *Luke* is quite ſilent on that Head, although within the Compaſs of his Hiſtory, as *Jerom* obſerved (13); and his Silence ought to be of more Weight, than the Authority of Writers, who lived ſome Ages after. *Origen*, who flouriſhed in the Third Century, was the firſt who mentioned St. *Peter*'s See of *Antioch*, ſaying, It was held by *Ignatius* after him (14). *Origen* was copied by *Euſebius*, and *Euſebius* by thoſe, who came after him.

On Tranſlations a modern Writer of the Court of *Rome* reaſons thus: "Tranſlations have been ſeverely cenſured by the Fathers, "and often condemned both by the Popes and the Councils. "But neither can the Councils tie the Hands of the Popes, nor "can one Pope tie the Hands of another. The Power of diſ-

"penſing

(9) Id. ibid. (10) Id. ibid. & ep. 290, 293. (11) Gelaſ. II. ep. 1. (12) See above p. 5. (13) Hier. in Gal. 2. (14) Orig. in Luc. hom. 6.

the See of *Rome*, and to that of *Theſſalonica*; *Rufus*, who preſided there, having been appointed by him to determine, in his Name, all Diſputes that might ariſe among them. He lets them know, that, in virtue of the Submiſſion, which they owed to the See of *Theſſalonica*, and he required of them, they were to ordain no Biſhops, aſſemble no Councils, without the Knowledge and Conſent of *Rufus*; which was reſtraining to the See of *Theſſalonica*, that is, engroſſing to himſelf (for the Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* acted only as his Vicar), the Privileges, which the Council of *Nice* had granted to all Metropolitans. It is obſervable, that in this very Letter *Celeſtine* affecteth an intire Obedience to the Canons of the Church. *We ought*, ſayeth he, *to ſubject our Will to the Rules, and not the Rules to our Will; we ought to conform to the Canons, and ſtrictly obſerve what they preſcribe* [x]. But he did not govern himſelf by this Maxim upon other Occaſions.

[x] Coll. Rom. per Holſten. p. 85---87.

" penſing with all canonical Impediments the Popes hold by di-
" vine Right; which therefore can only be reſtrained by divine
" Authority. However, Tranſlations ought not to be allowed,
" but on moſt urgent Occaſions; and it is in order to prevent
" them, that the Popes have adopted the wiſe Regulations of
" ſome well-governed Republics, where certain Goods are not
" prohibited, but loaded with ſuch Cuſtoms as are next to a Pro-
" hibition (15)." The Canons were made for the Good of the Church, and the People; and therefore cannot be binding when they oppoſe either. Hence it follows, that there being in ſuch Caſes no Room left for a Diſpenſation, nothing ought in Juſtice to be exacted for it. And yet, let the Occaſion be ever ſo urgent, a very conſiderable Sum muſt be paid into the Apoſtolic Chamber for the pretended Diſpenſation. If the Occaſion is not urgent, they allow the Canons to be binding; and what can induce the Popes to diſpenſe with them, but that, which one of them taxed thoſe Biſhops with, who ſeek Tranſlations, *Avarice, filthy Lucre, and an ungodly Deſire of greater Wealth* (16)? as if the Canons had been made with no other View but to give the Popes an Opportunity of filling their Coffers by granting Leave to tranſgreſs them.

(15) Contius de Curia Romana. (16) Anaſt. ep. 2.

He complaineth of several Abuses that prevailed in some Churches of Gaul.

The following Year 428. he wrote a long Letter to the Bishops of the Provinces of *Vienne* and *Narbonne*, against several Abuses that prevailed in those Parts. This Letter he beginneth quite in the Style of a modern Pope: *As I am*, saith he, *appointed by God to watch over his Church, it is incumbent upon me every-where to root out evil Practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my Pastoral Vigilance is restrained by no Bounds, but extendeth to all Places where Christ is known and adored.* Thus, under the Name of *Pastoral Vigilance*, he extendeth at once his Authority and Jurisdiction over all the Churches of the Christian World. The first Abuse he complaineth of was a particular Dress assumed by some Bishops, wearing, in Imitation of the Monks, a Cloke and Girdle. With this Novelty *Celestine* findeth great Fault, and exhorts the Bishops to distinguish themselves from the People by their Doctrine, and not by the Mode of their Dress, by the internal Purity of their Souls, and not by the external Attire of their Bodies. What a large Field would the so many different and ridiculous Habits of the Monks and Friers, the costly Attire of Bishops and Cardinals, and, above all, the gorgeous and stately Apparel of *Celestine*'s own Successors, have opened for his Zeal, had he lived in our Days? He pleasantly adds, that if they understood, in a literal Sense, the Words of our Saviour, *Let your Loins be girded about* [y], they ought to interpret other Passages after the same manner, and never appear without Lamps and Staves in their Hands. And was not this condemning, at least ridiculing, the Monkish Habits, an essential Part of which is the Girdle (A)? The other Abuses, which

Bishops not distinguished formerly by their Dress from the Laity.

[y] Luke xii. 25.

(A) From this Passage it is manifest, that in those Days the Bishops and other Ecclesiastics, were not yet distinguished by their Dress from the Laity, at least when they were not actually discharging the Functions of their Office. Whether they used

which *Celeſtine* wanted to have redreſſed, have nothing new in them, or that have not been mentioned before in this Hiſtory; and therefore I omit repeating them here.

About this time the *Pelagian* Doctrine began to prevail, almoſt univerſally, in *Britain*, being preached here either by the Natives, who had adhered to their Countryman *Pelagius* abroad, and were returned home, or by others, who, finding themſelves, in virtue of the Imperial Laws, every-where perſecuted on the Continent, had fled to this Iſland for Shelter. The leading Man of the Party here was one *Agricola*, the Son of a *Britiſh* Biſhop named *Severianus* [a]. But that *Severianus* himſelf, or any of his Collegues, countenanced their Doctrine, is not vouched by any of the Antients. *Faſtidius* indeed, a *Britiſh* Writer, who flouriſhed at this time, betrayeth, in his Writeings, a ſtrong Bias to the *Pelagian* Tenets. But it may be juſtly queſtioned whether he was a Biſhop. For in the Treatiſe which he wrote on the Duties of a Chriſtian Life, he maketh Excuſes for taking upon him to inſtruct others; which a Biſhop would hardly have

The Pelagian *Doctrine prevaileth in* Britain.

[a] Proſp. chr.

uſed even then any particular Dreſs or Attire, may be juſtly queſtioned. *Dionyſius Exiguus* thinks they did not (1); and F. *Sirmond* is of the ſame Opinion. For, according to *Sirmond*, the Eccleſiaſtics uſed no other Dreſs in the Church, but that which they wore daily out of the Church. However, as they reſerved the beſt Habits they had for the Sacred Functions, and uſed them on no other Occaſion, when Modes in Dreſs began to alter, the Faſhion changed before they were worn out. Thus, by degrees, the Dreſs, which they uſed in the Church, varied from their common Dreſs, as well as from that of the People; the new Habits for the Service of the Church being made after the Mode of the antient, in which they were accuſtomed to perform their Functions. *Anaſtaſius*, *Platina*, and *Baronius*, give us particular Accounts, I may ſay, the Hiſtory of every Part of the Maſs-Prieſt's Dreſs, inſtituted, according to them, and uſed long before this time.

(1) Biblioth. Jur. Can. per Juſtel. t. 1. p. 210.

have done, that being his Province and Duty (B). However, if the *Britiſh* Biſhops did not countenance the *Pelagian* Doctrine, neither did they oppoſe it, at leaſt with the Vigour they might; elſe it had never made, in ſo ſhort a time, the Progreſs it did. The Catholics, having no Proſpect of Relief from their own Paſtors, had recourſe to thoſe of *Gaul*; who, being affected with their Complaints, immediately ſummoned a great Council, and choſe, with one Voice, St. *Germanus* Biſhop of *Auxerre*, and St. *Lupus* Biſhop of *Troyes*, to paſs over into *Britain*, and there maintain the Catholic Cauſe [b]. Thus *Conſtantius*, a Preſbyter of *Lyons*, who lived in this Century, and after him *Bede*. But *Proſper*, who flouriſhed likewiſe in this Century, writes, that the two Prelates were ſent into *Britain* by *Celeſtine* [c]. The *Gallican* Biſhops, perhaps, acquainted the Pope with the Choice they had made, and he approved it; which was enough for *Proſper*, a notorious Flatterer of the Popes, to aſcribe the whole to *Celeſtine*. The Two Miſſionaries ſet out for *Britain* in the latter End of the Year 429. and, paſſing through *Paris*, had an Interview there with the famous St. *Genevieve*, who, at the Perſuaſion of St. *Germanus*, to whom her future Sanctity was revealed, promiſed to conſecrate her Virginity to *Jeſus Chriſt*. From *Paris* they purſued their Journey to the Sea-ſide, and embarqued; but were very near being caſt away by a Storm, before they reached the *Britiſh* Coaſt. This Storm

The Britons *recur to the* Gallican *Biſhops, who ſend* Germanus *and* Lupus *into* Britain.

Their Journey.

[b] Conſtant. l. 1. c. 19. apud Surium, l. 4. [c] Proſp. chron.

(B) Beſides, the *Benedictines*, in their Edition of the Works of St. *Auſtin*, aſſure us, that, in a very antient Manuſcript Copy of *Gennadius*, *Faſtidius* is not ſtyled Biſhop, the Word *Biſhop* being added to the original Copy in a much freſher Hand. And yet moſt of our modern Writers not only ſuppoſe him to have been Biſhop, but Biſhop of *London* (2).

(2) Vid. Miræum in not. ad Gennad.

Storm the Author ſuppoſeth to have been raiſed by the Devil; but we may more reaſonably ſuppoſe it to have been raiſed by himſelf, that he might have an Opportunity of diſplaying the Power of his Imagination in deſcribing it, and make room for the Miracle by which it was laid. For St. *Germanus*, who had ſlept the whole time, being awaked by the Mariners juſt as the Veſſel was on the point of ſinking, firſt reprimanded the Sea, as *Neptune* did of old the Winds, for attempting to defeat their pious Undertaking; and, then pouring into it a few Drops of Oil, aſſwaged at once the Fury of the Waves, and miraculouſly reſtored the wiſhed-for Calm. Upon their Landing, the People flocked to them from all Parts; and, being convinced of the Truth which they preached, by the Miracles which they wrought, abjured daily by Thouſands the *Pelagian* Doctrine, which they had ſo raſhly embraced. But their Teachers and Leaders kept out of the Way: They were unwilling to enter the Liſts with Men, whom Heaven had endowed with ſuch miraculous Powers. However, as the Whole of their Cauſe was now at ſtake, they agreed at laſt to meet the two Prelates, and met them accordingly. But this Meeting proved fatal to the *Pelagian* Cauſe; for the *Pelagians* declineing to undertake the Cure of a blind Girl that was preſented to them, St. *Germanus*, by applying to her Eyes ſome Reliques, which he always carried about him, cured her at once of her Blindneſs, and with her the whole Iſland [d]. But theſe Miracles were ſoon forgotten: According to the ſame Author, the *Pelagian* Hereſy took root again, and new Miracles were wanted to check its Growth. *Germanus* therefore, in the Year 447. returned to *Britain*; exerted here anew his wonder-working Power, confounded his Antagoniſts, and, not leaving behind him the leaſt Shoot of ſo poiſonous a Weed, returned

Miracles wrought by them on the Sea, and after their landing.

The whole Iſland reclaimed.

Germanus *returneth anew, and utterly roots out the* Pelagian *Hereſy.*

[d] Conſtant. ubi ſupra.

ed in Triumph to *Gaul* [e]. In his second Journey into *Britain* he is said to have been attended by St. *Severus*, Bishop of *Treves*.

Beginning of the Dispute between Nestorius *and St.* Cyril.

The following Year, 430. is one of the most remarkable Years in the Annals of the Church. For it was in that Year that the famous Dispute began between *Nestorius* Bishop of *Constantinople* and St. *Cyril* Bishop of *Alexandria*, which rent the whole Church into Two opposite and irreconcileable Factions. What gave Occasion to that Dispute was, the Title of *Mother of God*, which began at this time to be given to the Virgin *Mary*. Such a Title *Nestorius* thought very improper, derogatory to the Majesty of the Eternal Creator, and only calculated to lead the Unwary into gross Mistakes concerning the Mystery of the Incarnation, and the Nature of Christ. For he argued, that it could not be said, without a kind of Blasphemy, that *God was born of a Woman*, that *God had suffered*, that *God had died*, nor, consequently, that *the Virgin* Mary *was the Mother of God*. *We must not imagine*, said he, *that God, or the Verb, was born of the Virgin* Mary; *but we ought to believe, that God, or the Verb, was united to him, who was born of the Virgin* Mary [f]. The Title of *Mother of Christ* was that which he thought should be given to the Virgin, as containing all that was meant by the other, without the Impropriety and Offence of the Expression, and without Danger of confounding the Divine Nature of Christ with the Human. This Doctrine was received, and maintained with great Warmth by some, both Ecclesiastics and Laymen, and with no less Warmth opposed by others. The latter thought it was calling in question the Divinity of Christ, and degrading the Virgin *Mary*, to rob her of the glorious Title of the *Mother of God*; and her Glory was now become one of their highest Concerns.

What occasioned this Dispute.

[e] Constant. vit. S. Ger. l. 2. c. 1. apud Sur. t. 3. 30. Julii.
[f] Concil. t. 3. p. 1124. Cyr. ep. 38. Petav, dog. theolog. t. 4. l. 1. 7.

Concerns. At the Head of theſe was St. *Cyril*, a Man of a moſt haughty and imperious Temper, impatient of Contradiction, obſtinately wedded to his own Opinion, paſſionate, revengeful, and more eagerly bent, at leaſt in the preſent Diſpute, upon conquering his Adverſary, than diſcovering the Truth. In ſome of theſe Qualities he was well matched by *Neſtorius*; but the latter was not ſo eager for Victory, ſo tenacious of his own Opinion, or rather of his own Terms (for the whole Diſpute was about Terms), as not to be ready to explain them; which had he been allowed to do, an End had been put at once to the Quarrel. But *Cyril* would hearken to no Explanations. He peremptorily required *Neſtorius* to acknowledge and confeſs the Virgin *Mary* to be the *Mother of God*, without any Diſtinction or Explanation; and becauſe he would not comply, he defamed him all over the Eaſt, as a Reviver of the Hereſy of *Paul* of *Samoſata*, denying the real Union between the Human and the Divine Nature in the Perſon of Chriſt; ſtirred up the People of *Conſtantinople*, his own Flock, againſt him, and ſpared no Pains to diſcredit him with the Emperor, and other great Perſons at Court. For he wrote Three Letters to Court; one to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, to his Wife *Eudoxia*, and to his Siſter *Pulcheria*; another *to the Queen's Virgins, and Brides of Chriſt*, that is, to *Pulcheria* and her Siſters; and a third *to the Empreſſes*, that is, to *Eudoxia* and *Pulcheria*. The Purport of theſe Letters was to prove, that the Virgin *Mary* was, and ought to be ſtyled, the *Mother of God*; that to diſpute ſuch a Title was rank Hereſy; and that whoever diſputed it was unworthy of the Protection of the Imperial Family.

The Characters of Cyril *and* Neſtorius.

Cyril *will not allow* Neſtorius *to explain his Meaning.*

He defameth him, and writeth againſt him to the Emperor.

Neſtorius, being now ſenſible, that *Cyril* was determined to keep no Meaſures with him, reſolved, in his Turn, to keep none with one, who had given him ſo great Provocation. He therefore aſſembled a Council at *Conſtantinople*, and there, with the unanimous

Nestorius excommunicateth and deposeth those who side with Cyril.

nimous Consent of the Bishops who composed it, he solemnly excommunicated the Laymen, and deposed the Ecclesiastics who rejected his Doctrine. He did not stop here, but caused several Ecclesiastics, Monks, and Laymen, the Friends of *Cyril*, to be apprehended, to be dragged to the public Prison, and to be there whipt very severely, as Disturbers of the public Peace, and Sowers of Sedition. What chiefly provoked him was, a Paper posted up in a public Place of the City, declaring him a Heretic, and guilty of the Heresy formerly held by *Paul* of *Samosata*, denying a true Union between the Verb and the Humanity in the Person of Christ; which was one of the many Calumnies broached against him by *Cyril* to blacken his Reputation.

Causeth some of them to be imprisoned and whipt.

Nestorius striveth to gain Celestine *and the Western Bishops.*

Thus were the Christians in the East divided into two opposite Parties irreconcileably incensed against each other, and reviling each other with all the opprobrious Names Malice and Rage could suggest. But *Cyril*'s Party was by far the most numerous and powerful. *Nestorius* therefore, having strove in vain to strengthen his Party in the East, resolved in the End to try the West, being well apprised, that the Western Bishops would be abundantly sufficient to turn the Scale. He therefore wrote a long Letter to *Celestine*, acquainting him with what had passed in the East, and explaining, without the least Disguise or Equivocation, the Doctrine he held; nay, he sent him all the Homilies which he had preached on that Subject. In this Letter he owneth his irreconcileable Aversion to the Words *Mother of God*, as raising Ideas, especially in the Minds of the Vulgar, inconsistent with the Majesty of the Supreme Being. He adds, that by disputing the true Title of *Mother of God*, he only meant, that the Verb was not born of the Virgin *Mary*[h].

Cyril writeth to Celestine, *and sendeth him the Homilies of* Nestorius, *with his own Comments upon them.*

St. *Cyril*, being informed, that *Nestorius* had wrote to *Celestine*, summoned a Council at *Alexandria*; and by their Advice, wrote the famous Letter to *Celestine*, which hath reached our Times. In that

[g] Concil. t. 3. p. 327. [h] Concil. t. 3. p. 349—356.

that Letter he acquainteth him with the State of Affairs in the Eaſt, and the Diſturbances raiſed there by *Neſtorius*, as if himſelf had been no-ways concerned in them; telleth him that it is abſolutely neceſſary that all the Biſhops of the Church ſhould unite as one Man againſt that Prelate; that the Biſhops in the Eaſt are well diſpoſed to join in the common Cauſe; and that they only waited to know from him, whether they were to communicate with *Neſtorius*, or openly renounce his Communion. At the ſame time *Cyril* ſent to *Rome* the Homilies of *Neſtorius*, the Letters which he had wrote to him, his Anſwers, and with them a Writing containing the Sentiments of the Fathers concerning the Myſtery of the Incarnation. For the Goſpel, the *Teſtimony of Chriſt*, was already laid aſide, and the Teſtimony of Men taken, in moſt Diſputes, for the Rule and Standard of the Chriſtian Belief. The *Roman Catholics* have no Reaſon to brag, as they do, of the Recourſe had by St. *Cyril* on this Occaſion to the Pope. For *Poſidonius*, one of *Cyril*'s Deacons, who was diſpatched with the above-mentioned Papers to *Rome*, was directed, in his private Inſtructions, not to deliver them, but to bring them back to *Alexandria*, if he found that *Neſtorius* had not applied to *Celeſtine*[m]; ſo that if *Neſtorius* had not recurred to the Pope, *Cyril* never would. *Poſidonius* found, upon Inquiry, that *Neſtorius* had wrote to *Celeſtine*; and therefore delivered to him, purſuant to his Inſtructions, all the Papers with which he was charged. *Cyril* wrote in *Latin*, and even cauſed the Homilies of *Neſtorius* to be tranſlated into that Language, with his own Comments upon them; whereas *Neſtorius* had ſent them in the original *Greek*, and writ his Letters in the ſame Tongue; which had obliged *Celeſtine* to ſend them into *Gaul*, to be tranſlated there by the famous *Caſſian*, who was a Native of *Thrace*, and lived then at *Marſeilles*, there

The Popiſh Writers have no Occaſion to brag of the Recourſe had by Cyril *to* Celeſtine.

[m] Concil. t. 3. p. 346. & Concil. app. per Baluſ. p. 45.

there being none, it seemeth, in *Rome* or *Italy*, sufficiently qualified for that Task. *Cyril* having thus got the Start of his Antagonist, though he wrote the last, *Celestine* was, by his Writings, prejudiced to such a Degree against *Nestorius*, before he had heard what he had to offer in his Defence, that all he did or could offer afterwards availed him nothing. *Celestine* indeed perused all his Papers as soon as they were translated and sent back from *Gaul*, but perused them with the strong Prejudices which he had imbibed from the Writings of *Cyril*; so that he discovered in each Homily, nay, in every Line, *Heresies*, *Impieties*, and *Blasphemies*, not to be uttered or heard.

Nestorius *condemned by a Council held at* Rome.

A Council was therefore assembled at *Rome*, to condemn, rather than to examine, the *new Doctrine*. At this Council assisted most of the Western Bishops [n]; *Celestine* presided, the Homilies were read, and with them the Letters both of *Cyril* and *Nestorius*. *Celestine* made a long Speech, to prove not only by the Passages which *Cyril* had suggested to him out of the Fathers, but by others from St. *Hilarius*, from Pope *Damasus*, and from a Hymn which St. *Ambrose* had caused to be yearly sung by his People on *Christmas-day*, that *the Virgin* Mary *was truly the Mother of God* [o]. When he had done, *Nestorius* was declared the Author of a *new and very dangerous Heresy*, *Cyril* was highly extolled for opposing it, his Doctrine was applauded by all as strictly orthodox, and Sentence of Deposition pronounced against such Ecclesiastics as should refuse to sign it.

Celestine *acquainteth* Nestorius *with the Judgment of the Western Bishops.*

Before the Council broke up *Celestine* wrote to *Nestorius*, acquainting him with the Judgment of the Western Bishops upon this Dispute; and at the same time warning him, that if, in the Term of Ten Days after the Receipt of that Letter, he did not

[n] Mercat. 1. p. 71. [o] Concil. t. 3. p. 379. Arnobii Junioris cum Serap. conflict. p. 548.

not publicly condemn the Doctrine which he had hitherto taught, and teach the Doctrine which he had hitherto condemned, he ſhould be depoſed without any further Delay, and cut off from the Communion of the Church [p]. This Letter is dated the 11th of *Auguſt* of this Year 430. He wrote ſeveral other Letters, all bearing the ſame Date, *viz.* one to *Cyril*, one to the Clergy, Monks, and People of *Conſtantinople*; one to each of the Biſhops of the chief Sees, and one to the Church of *Antioch*. All theſe Letters were to the ſame Effect, *viz.* to acquaint thoſe, to whom they were addreſſed, with the Sentence pronounced by the Council of *Rome* againſt *Neſtorius*, and encourage them to be aſſiſting in the Execution of it. His Letter to *Cyril* deſerveth particular Notice: for he there appointeth him to act in the preſent Affair, that is in excommunicating and depoſing *Neſtorius*, as *his Vicegerent, in the Name, and with the Authority, of his See* [q]. It muſt be obſerved here, that the Biſhops of *Rome*, neither alone, nor jointly with the whole Body of the Weſtern Biſhops, had, or even claimed at this time, the Power of depoſing the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, or indeed any other Biſhop in the Eaſt, without the Conſent and Concurrence of the Eaſtern Biſhops. This *Cyril* well knew; and therefore, leſt *Celeſtine* ſhould, on that Conſideration, decline giving Judgment againſt *Neſtorius*, he made him believe that the Eaſtern Biſhops were all diſpoſed to join againſt the pretended Hereſiarch; that they waited only his Determination, and were ready to concur, to a Man, in executing the Judgment which he ſhould give. This was making *Celeſtine* believe, that the Eaſtern Biſhops had choſen him for their Judge in the preſent Diſpute, and agreed to acquieſce to his Deciſion. It was upon this Preſumption that *Celeſtine* pronounced the above-mentioned Sentence againſt *Neſtorius*, and appointed *Cyril*

Celeſtine appointeth Cyril *his Vicegerent.*

He is impoſed upon by Cyril.

[p] Concil. t. 3. p. 374—376. [q] Ibid. p. 349.

Cyril to act in his room, with the Authority which he falsely supposed to have been granted him on this Occasion. I say, *falsely*; for what *Cyril* wrote to him was absolutely false, *viz.* that all the Bishops in the East were ready to join him against *Nestorius*, and concur in executing the Sentence which he should pronounce. Several Bishops had declared for *Nestorius*, and not one, that we know of, against him, at the time *Cyril* wrote, besides *Cyril* himself, and the other *Egyptian* Bishops, who were intirely governed by him; nay, the Sentence pronounced at *Rome* was Matter of great Surprize to all, but more especially to *John* of *Antioch*, and *Juvenal* of *Jerusalem*, who could not help censuring, with some Sharpness, the Western Bishops, as acting rashly in an Affair that required the most mature Deliberation. But *Cyril* was chiefly to blame, who, to engage the WesternBishops on his Side, and by their means compass the Ruin of his Antagonist, had represented the State of Affairs very differently from what it really was.

It was doubtless a very extraordinary Thing for a Bishop of *Alexandria* to accept the Commission of Vicegerent or Deputy to the Bishop of *Rome*; and *Celestine* would hardly have thought of offering him such a Commission, if he had not been sensible that, from the Heat of his Passion upon this Occasion, he would be willing to act in any Capacity, that would impower him to hurt his Antagonist. So ably did the Popes, from the earliest times, avail themselves of every Circumstance, that could give them the Means to promote and extend their Jurisdiction.

Cyril *sendeth* Celestine's *Letter to* Nestorius; The above-mentioned Letters from *Celestine* were all sent to *Cyril*, who was to convey them to those they were addressed to; which he did accordingly, accompanying them with Letters of his own, all calculated to inflame his Collegues, and the rest of the Clergy, as well as the Laity, against *Nestorius* as an Enemy to *the Mother of God* and the Catholic Church.

Church. As for the Letter to *Neſtorius* himſelf, he diſpatched Four Biſhops with it to *Conſtantinople*, who choſe to deliver it to him while he was aſſiſting at Divine Service, in the great Church, with his Clergy, and many Perſons of Diſtinction belonging to the Court. His View in this was to render their Legation the more ſolemn, and thereby alarm the Populace, who hitherto had taken no part in the Quarrel. With *Celeſtine*'s Letter they delivered to him one from *Cyril*, peremptorily requiring him to retract his Errors, to confirm his Retraction with a ſolemn Oath, and publicly to anathematize Twelve Propoſitions contained in the Letter, and extracted out of his Works. *Cyril* let him know, that if he did not comply with his Demand, before the time prefixed by *Celeſtine* was expired, he would take care to have the Sentence of the Weſtern Biſhops executed with the utmoſt Rigour and Severity. *Neſtorius* received the Letters, and deſired the Legates to meet him the next Day at his own Houſe; but when they came, he did not admit them; nor did he return any Anſwer either to *Celeſtine* or *Cyril*. However, in a Sermon which he preached Six Days after, that is on *Saturday* the 13th of *December*, he declared, that to maintain the Peace and Tranquility of the Church, to put an End to the preſent Diſpute, which might be attended with greater Evils than his Enemies ſeemed to be aware of, he was ready to grant the Title of *Mother of God* to the Virgin *Mary*, *provided nothing elſe was thereby meant*: but that *the Man born of her was united to the Divinity* [r]. This Sermon, and another which he preached the next Day, the 14th of *December*, on the ſame Subject, he ſent to *John* Biſhop of *Antioch*, one of the moſt eminent Prelates both for Piety and Learning at that time in the Church. *John* peruſed them with great Attention, and finding nothing in them that was not, in his

and requireth him to retract his pretended Errors on pain of being depoſed.

Neſtorius *inclined to yield for the ſake of Peace.*

[r] Concil. t. 3. p. 395—410. Socr. l. 7. c. 34.

his Opinion, intirely agreeable to the Catholic Doctrine, he concluded the present Dispute to be happily ended. But *Cyril* was not yet satisfied; he peremptorily required *Nestorius* to anathematize the Twelve Propositions which I have mentioned above; and to anathematize them was, in Opinion of the Bishop of *Antioch*, and of almost all the Bishops of his Patriarchate, anathematizing the Doctrine of the Church, and approving that of the *Apollinarists*, which had been condemned by the Church. For *Cyril*, in combating the Distinction maintained by *Nestorius* between the Two Natures in Christ, seemed to have run headlong into the oppposite Doctrine confounding the Two Natures; insomuch that *John* of *Antioch* thought himself not only obliged to warn his Collegues in the East, by a circular Letter, against such *impious Doctrines*, but to cause them to be confuted in Writing, by Two of the most learned Prelates of his Patriarchate[r]. They were answered by *Cyril*, incapable of yielding, or ever giveing up a Cause, which he had once undertaken to defend. Thus a new Quarrel broke out between *Cyril* and the Bishops of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, of which it is foreign to my Purpose to give here an Account.

The Doctrine of Cyril judged impious by the Orientals.

Nestorius, foreseeing the Storm that the Dispute between him and *Cyril* was likely to raise in the Church, had, in order to prevent it, applied to the Emperor *Theodosius* for the assembling of an Oecumenical Council, even before he received the Letters of *Celestine* and *Cyril*, which I have mentioned above; and, upon his Application, the Emperor had summoned a Council to meet at *Ephesus* by *Whitsuntide* of the following Year 431. The Letter, which *Theodosius* wrote on that Occasion, was dated the 19th of *November* 430, and addressed to all the Metropolitans, who were thereby injoined to attend at the

An Oecumenical Council summoned by the Emperor to meet at Ephesus.

[r] Concil. t. 3. p. 1150. Liberat. c. 4.

the Place and Time appointed, and bring with them ſuch of their Suffragans as might be well ſpared from the Service of the Churches in their reſpective Provinces. Beſides the circular Letter to all Metropolitans in common, *Theodoſius* wrote to *Cyril* in particular, to let him know that he looked upon him as the ſole Author of the preſent Diſturbances, and therefore expected that he would not fail to attend the Council at the time appointed; that from him he would admit of no Excuſe; that his punctual Compliance with the preſent Order was the only means of regaining his Favour, and inclining him to think that it was not any private Pique or Animoſity, but a Perſuaſion that he was defending the Truth, which had prompted him to act, as he had hitherto done, ſo contrary to all the Rules of Modeſty and Diſcretion. In the ſame Letter he reproacheth *Cyril*, and in the ſharpeſt Terms, with Pride, Arrogance, and Preſumption; and even chargeth him with having attempted to ſow Diviſions in the Imperial Family. But this Charge was groundleſs, having no other Foundation, but *Cyril*'s having wrote apart to *Pulcheria* and her Siſters, which the Emperor ſuppoſed to have been done with a Deſign to raiſe a Miſunderſtanding between him and them [t].

His Letter to Cyril.

The Council met at the Time and Place appointed, purſuant to the Emperor's Orders. But every thing was tranſacted in that Aſſembly ſo contrary to all the Rules of Juſtice, and even of Decency, with ſo much Prejudice and Animoſity, that they ſeemed to be all actuated by the Spirit of *Cyril*, and to have met with no other View than to gratify his private Paſſion and Revenge. *Cyril* preſided, who was the Party concerned, and the avowed Enemy of *Neſtorius*. They began their Seſſions before the Arrival of *John* of *Antioch*, and the Biſhops of that Patriarchate, who were ſuppoſed to favour *Neſtorius*, though they had certain Intelligence of their being

Irregular Proceedings of the Council.

[t] Liberat. c. 4. Concil. t. 3. p. 434.

within a few Days Journey of *Epheſus*; nay, they would not even wait for the Pope's Legates, and a number of Biſhops who were coming from *Italy*, and the Iſland of *Sicily*. *Neſtorius*, and Count *Candidianus*, whom the Emperor had ſent to aſſiſt at the Council in his Name, earneſtly begged them to put off the Seſſions only for Four Days longer, aſſuring them that *John* and his Suffragans would reach *Epheſus* within that Time. But all in vain: they were determined to condemn *Neſtorius*, right or wrong; and therefore could by no means be prevailed upon to wait the Arrival of thoſe who, they apprehended, would oppoſe, and perhaps might intirely defeat the End for which alone they ſeemed to believe they had been aſſembled. *Neſtorius* was ſummoned to appear the very next Day, and clear himſelf before the Council of the impious Doctrine with which he was charged. He refuſed to comply till the Orientals, that is, thoſe of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, were arrived; and, upon that Refuſal, the Council met very early next Morning, read all his Letters and Homilies, condemned the Doctrine they contained, approved the Doctrine of *Cyril*, whoſe Letters were likewiſe read; and cloſed this very remarkable Sentence of Depoſition and Excommunication againſt *Neſtorius* in the following Terms; *Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, againſt whom the moſt wicked* Neſtorius *hath leveled his Blaſphemies, declareth him, by the Mouth of this Council, deprived of the Epiſcopal Dignity, and cut off from the Communion of the Epiſcopal Order* [u]. This Sentence was ſigned by all the Biſhops who were preſent, paſted up in the moſt public Places of *Epheſus*, and notified to all the Inhabitants by the Criers of the City. It was no ſooner known, than the whole City reſounded with loud Shouts of Joy, the Streets were illuminated, and the People, crouding to the Church where the Council was held, attended the Biſhops, with lighted Torches in their Hands,

The Sentence they pronoundagainſt Neſtorius.

[u] Concil. ibid. p. 534.

Hands, and great Acclamations, to their reſpective Habitations, the Women walking before them, and burning Perfumes [w]. It had been as dangerous for *Neſtorius* to ſhew himſelf in *Epheſus*, at this Juncture, as it was formerly for St. *Paul*, the *Epheſians* being no leſs devoted now to the Virgin *Mary* than they were in the Apoſtle's Time to their great *Diana*, and their Superſtition no leſs miſchievous, although the Object was changed. The Virgin *Mary* was the Patroneſs of *Epheſus*, the *Epheſians* believing then that they poſſeſſed her Body. But it is now believed by the Church of *Rome*, that ſhe was taken up in Soul and Body into Heaven, and the Feſtival of her *Aſſumption* is kept with great Solemnity on the 15th of *Auguſt*, being preceded by a Vigil or Faſt. The Council took care to acquaint *Neſtorius* with the Sentence which they had pronounced againſt him; and the Note, which they wrote to him on that Occaſion, ſheweth but too plainly that they were ſwayed in all they did by Paſſion alone. For the Note was thus directed; *To* Neſtorius *a ſecond* Judas [x].

In what Terms they quainted Neſtorius *with the Sentence pronounced againſt him.*

Such is the Account which the Antients give us of the Firſt Oecumenical Council of *Epheſus*, one of the Four, which *Gregory the Great* received with as much Veneration as the Four Goſpels [y]. But notwithſtanding his Authority, we may, perhaps, with more Truth, apply to this Council than to any other what *Nazianzen* wrote of the Councils of his Time, *viz.* that *he had never ſeen an Aſſembly of Biſhops that ended well*; that, *by aſſembling, they had always heightened rather than cured the Evil*; that, *in ſuch Aſſemblies, Paſſion, Jealouſy, Prejudice, Envy, the Deſire of Victory generally prevailed*; and that *thoſe who took upon them to judge others, were, generally ſpeaking, ſwayed by ſome private Grudge, their Zeal being owing more to the Ill-will which they bore to the Criminals, than the Averſion which they had to their Crimes* [z]. As

The Council of Epheſus *unworthy of that Name.*

[w] Concil. ibid. p. 534—547. [x] Concil. t. 1. p. 560.
[y] Greg. l. 1. ep. 24. [z] Naz. ep. 55.

to the present Assembly, it may be justly questioned whether it deserves the Name of a Council, or ought not rather to be styled a seditious and tumultuary Conventicle of Men, assembled with no other View but to revenge the private Quarrel of their Head and Leader. For they met against the Will of the Imperial Commissioner Count *Candidianus*, who represented the Person of the Emperor; nay, upon his acquainting them, that it was the Will of the Emperor they should wait the Arrival of the Oriental and Western Bishops, they drove him by Force out of the Assembly. *Candidianus*, seeing the Emperor's Orders thus trampled under foot by the riotous Bishops, entered a Protest against their Proceedings, and declared them null. This Protest was addressed, *To* Cyril, *and the Bishops assembled with him*[a]. *Nestorius* likewise, Seven Bishops who were assembled with him, and Sixty-eight more, all protested against the Meeting of the Council until the Arrival of the Orientals: so that Seventy-six Bishops, who were then actually in *Ephesus*, protested against, and absented themselves from the Council. As therefore neither the Orientals, nor the Western Bishops, were yet come, the Assembly was composed only of *Egyptians* and *Asiatics*, who were intirely devoted to *Cyril*. But how irregular soever their Meeting was, their Method of acting, after they met, was no less irregular. *Cyril*, who was the Party concerned, and the avowed Enemy of *Nestorius*, received the Depositions against him, examined the Witnesses, gave what Explication he pleased to his Words, and delivered his Opinion the first; which was acting in open Contradiction to the known Laws of Justice and Religion. In the first Session, several Things were transacted, that might have given full Employment for several Sessions. How could they examine, in so short a time, the Twelve Propositions which *Cyril* required *Nestorius* to anathematize

Is protested against by the Imperial Commissioner and Seventy-six Bishops.

They act contrary to all Rules of Justice and Religion.

[a] Concil. ibid. p. 702.

thematize, Propoſitions that were capable of ſo many different Interpretations, that were afterwards ſo differently interpreted, and occaſioned endleſs Quarrels and Diſputes, ſome admitting them as Catholic, and rejecting the oppoſite Propoſitions as heretical; others admitting the oppoſite Propoſitions as Catholic, and rejecting them as heretical, without being able to agree in any thing elſe but in anathematizing and curſing each other? How could they compare the many Paſſages out of the Homilies of *Neſtorius*, with the different Contexts, in order to find out his true Meaning? To examine ſo many different Propoſitions, all relating to a Subject above our Comprehenſion, and in Terms hardly intelligible to the moſt ſpeculative Underſtanding; to declare which were Heterodox, and which Orthodox, which were agreeable, and which diſagreeable, to the Doctrine of the Fathers (for the Scripture was out of the Queſtion), and all this in a few Hours, was, it muſt be owned, a moſt wondrous Performance. But the Orientals were at hand: *John* of *Antioch* was a Man of great Credit; it was apprehended, that the many Biſhops, who were then in *Epheſus*, and had abſented themſelves from the Council, might join him, and he join *Neſtorius*. Diſpatch was therefore to be uſed, and the Buſineſs of many Seſſions tranſacted in one, that *Cyril* might have his full Revenge before their Arrival.

The Conduct of Cyril ſharply cenſured by his greateſt Friends.

It was in this Light that the Conduct of *Cyril* and the other Biſhops appeared to St. *Iſidore* of *Peluſium*, a Prelate of great Learning and Sagacity, and one who profeſſed a particular Friendſhip for *Cyril*. For, being informed of what had paſſed at *Epheſus*, he was ſo ſhocked at the Conduct of his Friend, that he could not help cenſuring it with great Severity. *Your Conduct*, ſaid he, in a private Letter to him, *and the Tragedy which you have lately acted at* Epheſus, *are Matter of great Surprize to ſome, and Diverſion to others. It is publicly ſaid, that you ſought only to be revenged on your Enemies, and that you have therein*

imitated your Uncle Theophylus; *and, indeed, although the Persons accused may be different, the Conduct of the Accusers is the same. You had better have continued quiet, than revenged your private Injuries at the Expence of the public Peace, and Tranquillity of the Church, by sowing Dissensions among her Members, under the Colour of Piety and Religion* [a]. *Theophylus*, whom *Isidore* mentioneth in his Letter, was Bishop of *Alexandria*, Uncle to *Cyril*, and at the Head of the Faction that deposed *Chrysostom* [b].

The Orientals arrive.

Five Days after the Deposition of *Nestorius*, *John* of *Antioch* and the Orientals arrived; and great was their Surprize, when they were informed by Count *Candidianus*, who came to wait on them, of what had passed. *John* had always advised *Nestorius* to allow the Title of the *Mother of God* to the Virgin *Mary*, for the sake of Peace; but could not think him an Heretic for disputing it. But, as to the Doctrine of *Cyril*, he looked upon it as rank *Apollinarism*; and, as such, had caused it to be confuted. No wonder, therefore, if, upon hearing that the Doctrine of *Cyril* had been declared Catholic, that the Doctrine of *Nestorius* had been condemned as Heretical, and he excommunicated and deposed for holding it, He insisted, as he did, upon their agreeing to have those Points examined anew, and more maturely, before he would assist at the Council. This Demand he thought the more reasonable, as *Cyril* had assured him, by a Letter dated but Two Days before the Meeting of the Council, that they should not meet until his Arrival. But *Cyril*, as we may well imagine, would by no means consent to it; which so provoked *John*, that, after several Expostulatory Letters between him and *Cyril*, he assembled, at last, his Orientals apart, and, with them, such as adhered to him, about Fifty in all. In this new Council, the Proceedings of the other were examined; and, being found repugnant to the Canons, and

They insist upon the Points that had been so hastily decided, to be examined anew.

Which being refused by Cyril, *they assemble apart.*

[a] Isid. Pel. l. 2. ep. 110. [b] See above, p. 392.

and owing merely to Rancour and Paſſion, they were, by the whole Aſſembly, with one Voice, declared null. The Orientals did not ſtop here; but, after a ſtrict Examination of the Doctrine of *Cyril*, they declared it Heretical; and, in virtue of that Declaration, pronounced Sentence of Excommunication and Depoſition againſt him, againſt *Memnon* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, a zealous Stickler for his Doctrine, and againſt all the Biſhops who ſhould communicate with either, until they had publicly retracted their Errors. The Blow was ſoon returned by *Cyril*, and thoſe who ſided with him; the Orientals were all declared *Neſtorians*, and, with *Neſtorius*, depoſed, excommunicated, and anathematized. War being thus declared between the Two Councils, Expreſſes were immediately diſpatched, by both, to the Emperor, and their Friends at Court; for they were both ſenſible, that the Doctrine of thoſe, who had moſt Friends there, would, in the End, prove the moſt Orthodox. The Emperor read, with great Attention, the Accounts tranſmitted to him by both Parties, and would have approved and confirmed the Proceedings of the Orientals, had he not been diverted from it, firſt by his Phyſician named *John*, and afterwards by *Acacius* Biſhop of *Beræa*, who happened to be then at Court. For the preſent *Theodoſius* contented himſelf with approving the Depoſition of *Neſtorius*, of *Cyril*, and of *Memnon*, who, he ſaid, well deſerved ſuch a Puniſhment, as being the chief Authors of the preſent Diſturbances; *for, as to their Faith*, he added, *I believe they are all Three alike Orthodox*. Which was true; and more than both Councils had been able to find out.

The Two Councils anathematize and excommunicate one another.

Both recur to the Emperor.

He approves the Depoſition of Neſtorius, Cyril, *and* Memnon.

The Emperor, having taken this Reſolution, diſpatched Count *John* to *Epheſus*, with Orders to drive the Three Incendiaries, *Neſtorius*, *Cyril*, and *Memnon*, out of the City, and perſuade the Biſhops to aſſemble in One Council. Count *John*, ſoon after his Arrival, cauſed the Three Biſhops to be arreſted,

and

and confined; but could by no Means bring about an Accommodation between the Two Parties; the Orientals obstinately refusing to communicate with the Friends of *Cyril*, until they had anathematized his Doctrine; and his Friends no less obstinately requiring the Orientals to anathematize the Doctrine of *Nestorius*, before they would communicate with them: so that *John* was obliged, in the End, notwithstanding all the Pains he took, to acquaint the Emperor, that he had found the Minds of the Bishops so soured and exasperated against one another, that it was impossible ever to reconcile them. The Emperor, upon the Receipt of his Letter, dispatched an Order to both Councils, injoining them to send a certain Number of Deputies, both the same Number, to *Constantinople*, where he proposed to have the Points in Dispute impartially examined. In Compliance with this Order, the Two Councils sent each Eight Deputies, who immediately set out, with proper Instructions, for *Constantinople*; but, arriving at *Chalcedon*, on the opposite Side of the *Bosphorus*, they were stopped there, by an Order from the Emperor, it not being thought safe for the Orientals to enter *Constantinople*, the Monks, who were very numerous in that City, having prejudiced the Populace against them. They arrived at *Chalcedon* in the latter End of *August*; and, on the 4th of *September*, the Emperor came to the Palace of *Ruffinus*, in that Neighbourhood, and there heard both Parties, with great Patience. He was, at first, so favourable to the Orientals, that they thought themselves sure of Victory; and even wrote to their Friends at *Ephesus*, desiring them to thank him for the Kindness he had shewn them. But, to their great Surprize, the Face of Affairs changed at once. They had been already admitted Four times to the Emperor's Presence, and heard by him with much Kindness, but, in the Fifth Audience, which they thought would complete their Triumph, the Emperor, after receiving

All Three arrested by the Emperor's Order, who endeavours, in vain, to reconcile the Bishops.

He orders both Councils to send a certain Number of Deputies to Constantinople.

He hears them at Chalcedon.

Is, at first, favourable to the Orientals and Nestorius; *but afterwards declares against them.*

ing

ing them with great Coolneſs, told them, abruptly, that they had better admit both *Memnon* and *Cyril* to their Communion, and abandon the Defence of *Neſtorius*. They were thunderſtruck with ſuch a Propoſal, and ſtrongly remonſtrated againſt it. But *Theodoſius*, deaf to their Remonſtrances, returned the next Day to *Conſtantinople*, carrying with him the Deputies of the adverſe Party, in order to have a new Biſhop ordained by them, in the room of *Neſtorius*. Soon after his Return, he iſſued an Edict, declaring *Neſtorius* juſtly depoſed, reinſtating *Cyril* and *Memnon* in their Sees, and giving all the other Biſhops Leave to return to their reſpective Churches, they being all alike Orthodox[d]. This was declaring the Council diſſolved; and it was diſſolved accordingly; but the Diſturbances which it occaſioned, were not compoſed until many Years after.

To what this Change was owing.

The ſudden Change in the Emperor, with reſpect to the Orientals, is aſcribed, by *Acacius* Biſhop of *Beroea*, to the Gold that *Cyril* cauſed to be prodigally diſtributed, on this Occaſion, among the Courtiers. For *Acacius* writes, that one of the Eunuchs of the Court, by Name *Scholaſticus*, dying poſſeſſed of great Wealth, the Emperor found a Note among his Papers, acknowleging the Receipt of large Sums remitted to him by *Paul*, *Cyril*'s Nephew, in *Cyril*'s Name[e]. It is true, we are not bound to give Credit to *Acacius*, as *Du Pin* obſerveth. But in what other Manner can we account for ſo ſudden a Change, for ſuch an inconſiſtent Method of acting? The Emperor thinketh both Parties equally Orthodox, and yet declareth *Neſtorius* juſtly depoſed, and reſtoreth *Cyril* and *Memnon* to their Sees; and that ſoon after he had appeared more favourable to the Friends of *Neſtorius* than to thoſe of *Cyril*. To what elſe could this be owing, if it was not the Effect of Bribery?

The

[d] Concil. t. 3. p. 727—730. Cotel. Monum. Eccl. Græc. p. 41. [e] Lup. diverſ. ep. c. 41.

The Pope's Legates, *viz. Arcadius*, *Projectus*, and *Philippus*, the two former Bishops, and the latter a Presbyter, did not arrive at *Ephesus* until some time after the Condemnation of *Nestorius*; but they signed the Judgment that had been given against him, being directed by *Celestine* to *agree in all things with* Cyril. *Cyril* presided as Bishop of *Alexandria*, the first See after that of *Rome*. While he was absent, *Juvenal* Bishop of *Jerusalem* supplied his room; a plain Proof, that he did not preside as the Pope's Legate; for if he had, his room would not have been supplied by the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, but by Them. Besides, if *Cyril* had been vested with the Character of the Pope's Legate, what Occasion had there been to send Three more? *Bellarmine* and *Baronius* both allow this Council to have been assembled by the Emperor; but with the previous Approbation, say they, and by the Advice, of *Celestine*. That the Council was convened by the Emperor, is past all doubt, it being said, and repeated above twenty times in the Acts, that *they were assembled by the Will of the most religious Emperors*. But of *Celestine* not the least mention is ever made by any of the Fathers, not even by *Cyril*. The above-mentioned Writers found their Assertion on a Letter of St. *Austin*, and on the Acts of St. *Petronius*. But both these Pieces are now universally rejected as suppositious.

Cyril did not preside as the Pope's Legate.

The Council assembled without the Approbation of the Pope.

As to the Dispute, which occasioned the assembling of this Council, the contending Parties seem to have agreed in the Substance, and to have only quarreled about Words: at least the Emperor thought so, as I have observed above; and, what is more, *Nestorius* himself. For in the Letter which he wrote to *Celestine*, acquainting him with the Resolution *Theodosius* had taken of assembling a Council, he only told him, that it was for some important Affairs of the Church; adding, that as to the Dispute between him and the Bishop of *Alexandria*, it

The whole Dispute about Words.

was

was not a Matter of ſuch mighty Moment, as to require the Deciſion of an Oecumenical Council. And truly both *Neſtorius* and *Cyril*, ſo far as we can judge from their own Words, acknowleged One Perſon in Chriſt, and Two Natures, the Natures diſtinct, but inſeparably united; which was the Catholic Belief. Now the Subject of the Diſpute was, whether, in virtue of that Union between the Human and Divine Nature, the Properties of the former might, or might not, be aſcribed to God, and thoſe of the latter to Man. The Negative was maintained by *Neſtorius*, and the Affirmative by *Cyril*; the one rejecting as blaſphemous, and the other admitting as orthodox, the following Expreſſions; *God was born*, *God ſuffered*, *God died*, Mary *was the Mother of God*; which was plainly diſputing about Words only, or Expreſſions. It is true, *Cyril* charged *Neſtorius* with the Doctrine of *Paul* of *Samoſata*, for rejecting them; and *Neſtorius*, *Cyril* with that of *Apollinaris*, for admitting them; but neither owned the Tenets, that were by the other aſcribed to him: So that *Cyril* was only a Heretic of *Neſtorius*'s making, and *Neſtorius* of *Cyril*'s: *Neſtorius* acknowleged a real Union between the Two Natures in Chriſt, and *Cyril* a real Diſtinction. But they did not, and, perhaps, when they were once warmed with diſputing, would not, underſtand one another. *Neſtorianiſm*, ſayeth a modern *Roman Catholic* Writer [f], *is but an imaginary Hereſy. Had* Neſtorius *and St.* Cyril *underſtood one another, they had agreed, and prevented the Scandal which their Quarreling brought on the Church. But the* Greeks *have always been great Diſputants; and it was by them that moſt of the firſt Hereſies were broached. The Subject of their Diſputes was, generally ſpeaking, ſome metaphyſical Speculation; and their Method of handling it arrant Chicanery. From equivocal Terms they drew falſe Inferences, and from Inferences paſſed to Injuries.*

Neſtorianiſm *an imaginary Hereſy.*

Thus

[f] M. Simon. hiſt. crit. de la creance et des coutumes des nations du Levant.

Thus they became irreconcileable Enemies, and, forgeting Truth, sought only to hurt one another. Had they but coolly explained their Thoughts, they had found, that in most Cases no room was left, on either Side, for the Imputation of Heresy.

Nestorius *and* Cyril *agree in Substance.*

In the present Dispute *Cyril*, the more to oppose, or rather to provoke, *Nestorius*, affected to use, on all Occasions, not only the Expressions, which I have mentioned above, but others that seem to involve a still more apparent Contradiction; *viz. The Eternal was born in Time, the Impassible suffered, the Immortal died, Life died.* At these Expressions the Orientals were no less shocked than *Nestorius*; and therefore separating themselves from the Communion of *Cyril*, whom they concluded to have fallen into the Errors of *Apollinaris*, they insisted upon his either condemning or explaining the Expressions he used, before they would admit him to their Communion, or any, who communicated with him. He chose the latter; and then it appeared, that they had been all fighting the whole time in the Dark; for by those Expressions *Cyril* meant no more, than that Christ, who was God, was born, suffered, and died; that *Mary* was the Mother of Christ, who was God; the very Doctrine and Expressions which *Nestorius* had been all along contending for, and *Cyril* had been combating with so much Warmth. But *Nestorius* was already deposed by the Faction of *Cyril*, and *Maximus* chosen and ordained Bishop of *Constantinople* in his room.

What meant by the Communication of Idioms.

The Expressions of *Cyril* were approved by the Council of *Ephesus*, and have therefore been adopted by the Church of *Rome*. But her Schoolmen, well apprised of the Objections to which they are liable, to excuse them from Blasphemy, have been obliged to recur to what they call a *Communication of Idioms*, in virtue of which the Properties of both Natures, say they, may be ascribed to the *Hypostasis* or Person, in whom both Natures were united. Thus we may say,

ſay, according to them, *God was born*, *God ſuffered*, becauſe the Perſon, who was God, *was born*, and *ſuffered*. Thus indeed they excuſe the Expreſſions of *Cyril* from Blaſphemy: But ſtill it muſt be owned, that the Expreſſions uſed by *Neſtorius*, *Chriſt was born*, *Chriſt ſuffered*, *Chriſt died*, were at leaſt far more proper. For, after all, this *Communication of Idioms* is, in Fact, nothing elſe but a rhetorical Figure: So that *Cyril* ſpoke like an Orator, and *Neſtorius* like a Philoſopher: The Expreſſions of the former were, in a ſtrict Senſe, falſe and blaſphemous; thoſe of the latter, in the ſtricteſt Senſe, true and orthodox: Tropes and Figures ſerve only to diſguiſe the Truth, to lead Men into Errors, and therefore ought to be laid aſide by all who ſeriouſly inquire after Truth, or explain it to others. I ſhall conclude with obſerving, that if by a *Communication of Idioms* the Properties of the Human and Divine Nature may be aſcribed to the Perſon, in whom thoſe two Natures were united; the Properties of the Body and Soul might, by a like Communication, be aſcribed to the Perſon, in whom the Body and Soul are united: ſo that it might be ſaid, with as much Propriety, *Man is immortal*, *Man will never die*, becauſe the Soul is immortal, and will never die, as *God was mortal*, *God died*, becauſe the Humanity was mortal and died. The Caſe is parallel, and the *Communication of Idioms* muſt juſtify both Expreſſions, or neither.

The Expreſſions of Neſtorius *more proper than thoſe of* Cyril.

As to the Title of *Mother of God*, to which *Neſtorius* had a more than ordinary Averſion, he ſeemeth to have rejected it on a particular Account; for the ſame Reaſon that induced *Clement* XI. to ſuppreſs the Title of *Grandmother of God*, which, in his time, began to be commonly given to St. *Anne*; *viz.* becauſe *it was offenſive to pious Ears*; *piarum aurium offenſiva*. If the Virgin *Mary* was the Mother, St. *Anne* was, as properly ſpeaking, the Grandmother of God. Why then ſhould the Mother be robbed of

A particular Reaſon for rejecting the Title of Mother of God.

of so glorious a Title, while the Daughter is suffered to enjoy it? Why should *Nestorius* be deemed an Heretic for denying it to the Daughter, rather than *Clement* for denying it to the Mother? The one was as offensive to the Ears of *Nestorius*, as the other could possibly be to the Ears of *Clement*. However, the former did not consult his Ears alone, but his Reason too, as hath been shewn above; whereas the latter must have consulted his Ears only, there being no Shadow of Reason, why the one Title should be allowed, and not the other.

The Fate of Nestorius.

As for *Nestorius*, he received an Order from the Emperor, while the Council was still sitting, commanding him to quit *Ephesus*, and retire to the Monastery of St. *Euprepius* in the Suburbs of *Antioch*, where he had led a monastic Life before he was raised to the See of *Constantinople*. This Order he received with great Joy, having often declared, that he wished for nothing so much as to spend his Life in Solitude and Retirement, far from the Troubles that threatened the Church[f]. In the Letter, which he wrote to *Antiochus* the *Præfectus Prætorio*, by whom the Emperor's Order was communicated to him, he told him, that to be thus deposed, for standing up in Defence of the Orthodox Faith, was a greater Honour than he had ever presumed to aspire to, or hoped to attain. The only Favour he begged of *Antiochus* was, that he would employ his whole Interest at Court, in order to obtain public Letters of the Emperor, that might be read in all the Churches, condemning the Doctrine of *Cyril*[g]. The following Year 432, *Celestine* wrote a very pressing Letter to *Theodosius*, dated the 15th of *March*, conjuring him, as he tendered the Purity of the Faith, to confine *Nestorius* to some uninhabited Place, where it might not be in his Power to infect others with his pestilential Doctrine; which was begging the Emperor to drive him out, like a wild Beast, from human Society, to

He is ordered to return to his Monastery.

Is banished into Arabia at the Request of Celestine, and the Bishops of his Party.

[f] Evag. l. 1. c. 7. Concil. t. 3. p. 744. [g] Concil. app. p. 108.

to periſh in a Deſart. He wrote, at the ſame time, a circular Letter to the Biſhops in thoſe Parts, exhorting them to ſecond him with all their Power and Intereſt at Court[h]. *Theodoſius*, hearkening only to the Impulſes of his own Good-nature, withſtood all the Solicitations of *Neſtorius*'s Enemies, for Four Years. But, in the End, being made to believe, that by ſhewing Mercy to ſuch an obſtinate Heretic, he rendered himſelf unworthy of Mercy; and that to treat him with Severity was the moſt effectual Means of drawing down the Bleſſings of Heaven upon himſelf, and the Empire; his Good-nature yielded, and he iſſued an Order, addreſſed to *Iſidore*, then the *Præfectus Prætorio*, injoining him to cauſe *Neſtorius* to be conveyed to *Petra* in *Arabia*, to end his Days there, by way of Atonement for the Miſchief he had done. With him were baniſhed, to the ſame Place, Count *Irenæus*, his great Friend and Protector, and *Photius*, a Preſbyter of *Conſtantinople*, who had wrote in his Defence againſt *Cyril*[i]. The ſame Year the Emperor iſſued an Edict, dated the 30th of *July*, commanding the Diſciples of *Neſtorius* to be called *Simonians* (A); his Books to be every-where ſought for, and publicly burnt; and all Perſons, in whoſe Poſſeſſion they were, to deliver them up to the Magiſtrates. By the ſame Edict the *Neſtorians* were forbidden to hold any Aſſemblies in the Cities, Villages, or in the Fields, and the Places were confiſcated, where

His Books forbidden and ordered to be burnt.

[h] Concil. l. 3. p, 1070, 1071. [i] Concil. ib. p. 1058, 1059, & ap. p. 884.

(A) The Emperor ordered them to be ſo called, merely to render them odious; for there was not the leaſt Affinity between the Hereſy of *Simon* the Magician, and the Doctrine that was aſcribed to *Neſtorius*. In this *Theodoſius* followed the Example of his Predeceſſor *Conſtantine*, who, to diſgrace the *Arians*, and prejudice the Populace againſt them, ordered them to be called *Porphyrians*. For when a Man was once declared an Heretic, all Means of rendering him infamous were deemed juſt and lawful. But neither Edict ever took place.

where such Assemblies should be held, as well as the Estates of those who should frequent them [k]. This Edict was published both in *Greek* and in *Latin*, that it might be understood by the Subjects of both Empires.

Is frequently removed from one Place to another.

The Enemies of *Nestorius* were not yet satisfied; they thought his Confinement to *Petra* too mild a Punishment; and therefore before he had been long there, they prevailed upon the Emperor to remove him from *Petra* to *Oasis*, in the Desarts between *Egypt* and *Libya*, a Place to which the greatest Criminals were usually confined in those Days [l]. He was still in *Oasis*, when *Socrates* wrote, that is, in 439 [m], but the Town, being soon after surprised by the Barbarians, named *Blemmyes*, he was carried by them into Captivity, but set again at Liberty, and even informed by them, that the Town would, in a short time, be attacked anew by another Clan of Barbarians. Upon this Information he withdrew to the City of *Panopolis*, and immediately acquainted the Governor of *Thebais* with the Motives that had induced him to quit the Place, which he had been confined to by the Imperial Edict, intreating *his Highness (Celsitudinem tuam)* to notify them to the Emperor, and suffer him to continue there until his Pleasure was known. But the Governor happened to be a zealous Catholic, or rather a true Courtier; and therefore, without waiting for the Emperor's Order, he sent a Band of Soldiers to convey, or rather to drag, him to *Elephantine*, on the most distant Borders of his Government. This the Governor seemeth to have done on Purpose to destroy him, and thereby ingratiate himself both with the Church and the Court. For the Soldiers he employed on this Occasion were not *Romans*, but *Barbarians*; and when they were got above half-way to *Elephantine*, they were injoined, by a Counter-order from him, to bring

[k] Cod. Theod. t. 6. p. 190. Concil. t. 3. p. 1200. [l] Socr. l. 7. c 34. [m] Idem ib.

bring their Priſoner back to *Panopolis* with all poſſible Expedition. As he was hurried on by the mercileſs Barbarians, notwithſtanding his old Age, the Weakneſs attending it, and the Hurts he received from a Fall, he arrived at *Panopolis*, quite ſpent, and ſo worn out with the Fatigues of that painful Journey, that no one thought he could outlive it many Days. But the Governor was impatient to hear the News of his Death; and therefore, before he could recruit his Strength, quite exhauſted by this Journey, he obliged him to undertake another, ordering him to repair, without Delay, to a certain Place within the Territory of *Panopolis*. As he outlived this Journey too, the Governor, bent on having the Merit and Glory of deſtroying the pretended Hereſiarch, ordered him immediately to undertake a Fourth; and this put an End to all his Troubles. For Nature ſinking under the Fatigues he was forced to undergo, without Intermiſſion or Reſpite, his Strength quite failed him, and he died [k] (A).

Treated with great Barbarity.

His Death.

Such were the Sufferings, ſuch was the End, of the famous *Neſtorius*; and both reflect no ſmall Diſgrace on the Eccleſiaſtics of thoſe Times, eſpecially on *Celeſtine* and *Cyril*; for by them this cruel Perſecution was raiſed, and by them it was carried on; the Laymen being only the Miniſters of their Cruelty and Revenge. Such a Treatment was quite undeſerved by *Neſtorius*, with reſpect to his Doctrine, as I have ſhewn

Neſtorius himſelf a cruel Perſecutor.

[k] Evag. l. 1. c. 7.

(A) An anonymous Writer, quoted by *Evagrius* (1), relates, that before *Neſtorius* died, his Tongue was devoured by Vermin, which he interpreteth as a Puniſhment juſtly inflicted on him for the Blaſphemies he ſuppoſeth him to have uttered. This Account *Evagrius* ſeemeth not to have credited; but *Theodorus* the Reader, *Theophanes*, and *Theodoret*, have taken it upon the Word of the anonymous Writer, by whom it was probably invented to render the Name of the pretended *Hereſiarch* odious to Poſterity.

(1) Evag. l. 1. c. 7.

shewn already, but was not so, it must be owned, in another respect: for he was himself a most furious Persecutor of all those, who had the Misfortune to be stigmatized with the Name of Heretics; and it is not to be doubted, but *Cyril* would have met with the same Treatment at his Hands, had his Party prevailed, as he did at *Cyril*'s. In the Sermon, which he preached on the very Day of his Ordination, he thus addressed the Emperor, who was present: *Make the Orthodox Faith, O mighty Prince, reign alone on the Earth; and I will make you reign in Heaven. Lend me your Assistance to exterminate the* Heretics, *and I will lend you mine to exterminate the* Persians[l]. This was proclaiming War against all who dissented from him; and the War, thus proclaimed, he began, without Loss of Time, and pursued with the utmost Fury, causing the Imperial Laws against Heretics to be vigorously executed, and stirring up the Mob, not only in *Constantinople*, but in the neighbouring Provinces, against Dissenters of all Denominations. This occasioned an universal Confusion, and, in some Places, a great deal of Bloodshed; insomuch that the Emperor was obliged to interpose his Authority, and protect, to a certain Degree, as Friends to the State, those whom the Bishop was for exterminating as Enemies to the Church. I will not presume to interpret the Severity that was practised upon him, as a Judgment from Heaven for the Severity, which he had practised upon others; agreeably to those Words of our Saviour, *With what Measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you*[m]; but I cannot help looking upon the Treatment he met with, however severe, as a just and well-deserved Retaliation; and upon him as a Man altogether unworthy of our Compassion.

The Doctrine of the Jansenists *approved by* Celestine.

But to return to *Celestine*: In the Year 431, he wrote to the *Gallican* Bishops, exhorting them to stand up in Defence of the Doctrine of St. *Austin*, and

[l] Socr. l. 7. c. 29. [m] Mark iv. 24.

and to ſilence, with their Authority, all who oppoſed it: for it was oppoſed by many, and among the reſt, by the famous *Caſſian*, as utterly inconſiſtent with Merit and Freewill. To this Letter are commonly annexed Nine Articles concerning Grace and Freewill; and, in theſe Articles, ſtyled there, *The Authorities of the Biſhops of the Holy Apoſtolic See*, is contained, in the moſt plain and expreſs Terms, the Doctrine of the *Janſeniſts*, condemned in our Days by the famous Bull *Unigenitus* of *Clement* XI [n]. It is true, ſome pretend thoſe Articles to be falſly aſcribed to *Celeſtine*. But they have paſſed for his, ever ſince the Sixth to the preſent Century: they have been placed among his Decrees, by *Dionyſius Exiguus*; were quoted as his by *Petrus Diaconus* in 519, by *Creſconius* an *African* Biſhop towards the End of the Sixth Century, and by all, who have had Occaſion to mention them ſince that time.

The ſame Year died St. *Palladius*, the Firſt Biſhop of *Ireland*. He belonged to the *Roman* Church, and had been ſent by *Celeſtine*, ſome Years before, into *Britain*, to ſtop the Progreſs of the *Pelagian* Hereſy in this Iſland. From *Britain* he had paſſed over into *Ireland* (A); and, having converted there ſome

Palladius *the Firſt Biſhop of* Ireland.

[n] See the Works of St. Leo, by F. Queſnel, and Du Pin, Biblioth. eccl. t. 3. part. 2.

(A) *Proſper* writes, that he was ſent *ad Scotos*; whence the *Scotch* Writers conclude him to have been ſent into *Scotland*, and the *Scots* have long looked upon him as the Apoſtle of their Nation. But that he was ſent into *Ireland*, and not into *Scotland*, is manifeſt from *Proſper*'s own Words. For ſpeaking of *Celeſtine*, by whom *Palladius* was ſent into *Britain* to make head againſt the *Pelagians*; *while he endeavoured*, ſayeth he, *to maintain the* Roman *Iſland Catholic, he made a barbarous Iſland Chriſtian* (1). The Iſland therefore, which he *made Chriſtian*, was a different Iſland from that of *Britain*; and conſequently could not be *Scotland*. The Inhabitants of *Ireland*, began as early as the Fourth Century, to be known by the Name of *Scoti* or *Scots*; ſo that *Scoti*

(1) Proſp. Col. p. 410.

some of the Inhabitants, he returned to *Rome*, to beg of *Celestine*, that a Bishop might be sent thither. *Celestine* complied with his Request, ordained him First Bishop of *Ireland*, and sent him back into that Island. Thus *Prosper*, who lived at this very time [o]. The *Irish* Writers tell us, that, finding their Countrymen, whose Conversion was reserved by Heaven for St. *Patric*, very obstinate, he abandoned the Island, and died in the Country of the *Picts*, that is, in *Scotland*, on his Return to *Rome* [p]. His Body indeed was long worshipped in *Scotland*; but that is no Proof of his having ever been there (A).

The

[o] Prosp. in Coll. c. 41, & chron. [p] Vid. Boll. 17. Martii.

Scoti and *Hiberni* were but different Names of one and the same People. It is true, that St. *Patric*, in such of his Writings, as have been judged by the Critics the most authentic, seemeth to distinguish the *Scoti* from the *Hiberni*, but that Distinction is only with respect to Merit and Rank; for he speaketh constantly of the former as Men of a superior Rank to the latter. And indeed the Name *Hibernus*, although more antient by many Ages than that of *Scotus*, appeareth to have been in great Contempt among the neighbouring Nations in St. *Patric*'s Time (2). The *Hiberni* were perhaps the Mechanics, and the *Scoti* the Gentry, or Men who followed more noble Professions. By the latter was afterwards founded the Kingdom of *Scotland*. *Bollandus* is of Opinion, that the *Hiberni* came originally from *Britain*, and were the first Inhabitants of *Ireland*; and that the *Scoti*, a more warlike Race, come from some other Country, subdued the *Hiberni*, as the *Saxons* did the *Britons* (3).

(A) The learned Archbishop *Usher* will not allow *Palladius* to have been the First Bishop of *Ireland*; alleging against that Opinion several Fragments out of the Lives of *Irish* Saints, some of whom are said to have been Bishops, and to have converted many of their own Countrymen, as early as the Middle of the Fourth Century (4). From the Fragments he produceth I cannot judge of the Pieces themselves. But *Bollandus*, who seemeth to have perused them, maintains them to be of no earlier a Date than the Twelfth Century; and most of them to be fabulous, which indeed he proveth undeniably by several Passages quoted from them (5). And can the Authority of such Pieces invalidate, or indeed any-

(2) Boll. 17. Martii. (3) Boll. ibid. (4) Ush. Brit. eccl. ant. p. 781---794. (5) Boll. 17 Martii.

The ſame Writers tell us, that St. *Patrick* was at *Rome*, when *Celeſtine* received the News of the Death of *Palladius*; and that thereupon he ordained him Biſhop, on the 30th of *July* 432, about a Year after the Ordination of *Palladius*, whoſe Room he was ſent over to ſupply [q]. But that they are therein miſtaken, and that St. *Patrick* was not ordained until many Years after the Death of *Celeſtine*, I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

Celeſtine did not long outlive *Palladius*; for he died the following Year 432, on the 26th of *July*, having governed the *Roman* Church Nine Years, Ten Months, and Seventeen Days [r]. Both he and *Cyril* have been ſainted, merely in Conſideration of their extraordinary Feats againſt *Neſtorius*, and thoſe who adhered to him; for Cruelty to Heretics was now a cardinal Virtue, capable of atoning for the greateſt Crimes. As for *Cyril*, he had no better Title to that Honour, than the Monk *Ammonius*, whom he ſainted, and publicly commended as a holy Martyr, becauſe he died on the Rack for having attempted, at the Head of Five hundred riotous Monks, to aſſaſſinate, and dangerouſly wounded, *Oreſtes* the Governor of *Alexandria*, in a Quarrel between him and *Cyril* (B). *Celeſtine* was buried in the Cœmetery

[q] Ib. ibid. [r] Proſper. ann. 432.

any-ways affect the Authority of *Proſper*, who telleth us in expreſs Terms, that *Palladius* was ordained by *Celeſtine*, *the Firſt Biſhop of* Ireland? As for what the Primate offereth to elude the Authority of *Proſper*, it is ſcarce worthy of Notice; *viz* that the Word *Primus* is not to be found in the Edition of that Writer by *Du Cheſne*. For it is to be found, as *Uſher* himſelf owneth, in all the other Editions, and even in *Bede*, as well as in every other Author, who hath copied *Proſper*'s Chronicle.

(B) *The Biſhops of* Alexandria *had begun*, ſayeth *Socrates* (1), *to exceed the Limits of the Eccleſiaſtical Power, and intermeddle in Civil Affairs, imitating therein the Biſhop of* Rome, *whoſe ſacred Authority had long ſince been changed into Dominion and Empire.* The

(1) Socr. l. 7. c. 7.

Cœmetery of *Priſcilla*, where he is ſaid to have cauſed the Hiſtory of the Council of *Epheſus* to be painted.

The Governors of *Alexandria*, looking upon the Increaſe of the Epiſcopal Power, as a Diminution of the Civil, watched all Opportunities of mortifying the Biſhops, in order to reſtrain them within the Limits of the ſpiritual, and prevent their encroaching on the temporal, Juriſdiction. But *Cyril*, from the very Beginning of his Epiſcopacy, bid Defiance to the civil Power, acting in ſuch Manner as ſhewed too plainly, that he would be kept within no Bounds. For ſoon after his Inſtallation, he cauſed, by his own Authority, the Churches, which the *Novatians* were allowed to have in *Alexandria*, to be ſhut up, ſeized on the ſacred Utenſils, and plundering the Houſe of their Biſhop *Theopemptus*, drove him out of the City, ſtript of every thing he poſſeſſed (2). Not long after the *Jews*, who were very numerous in *Alexandria*, having one Night treacherouſly murdered ſeveral Chriſtians there, *Cyril* next Morning, by break of Day, put himſelf at the Head of the Chriſtian Mob, and, without the Knowlege of the Governor, took Poſſeſſion of the Synagogue, drove the *Jews* out of *Alexandria*, pillaged their Houſes, and allowed the Chriſtians, who were concerned with him in the Riot, to appropriate to themſelves all their Effects. This the Governor highly reſented, and not only rebuked *Cyril* very ſeverely for thus entrenching on his Juriſdiction, and uſurping a Power that did not become him; but wrote to the Emperor, complaining of him for ſnatching the Sword of Juſtice from him, to put it into the Hands of the undiſcerning Multitude. This occaſioned a Miſunderſtanding, or rather an avowed Enmity, between *Cyril* and *Oreſtes*. With the former ſided the Clergy, the greater Part of the Mob, and the Monks; with the latter the Soldiery, and the better Sort of the Citizens. As the Two Parties were ſtrangely animated againſt each other, there happened daily Skirmiſhes in the Streets of *Alexandria*. For the *Alexandrians*, as *Socrates* obſerveth (3), and is well known, were of all People the moſt ſeditious and ungovernable. The Friends of the Governor, generally ſpeaking, made their Party good, having the Soldiery on their Side. But one Day as *Oreſtes* was going out in his Chariot, attended by his Guards, he found himſelf very unexpectedly ſurrounded by no fewer than Five hundred Monks, come from the Mountains of *Nitria*, the Monks were, in thoſe Days, the ſtanding Army of the Biſhops; but are now of the Popes alone, who being ſenſible how ſerviceable ſuch a formidable Corps might prove to the Apoſtolick See, not only againſt the Laity, but the Biſhops themſelves, exempted them from their Juriſdiction, and made them immediately dependent on themſelves. But of the monkiſh Orders, their Founders, and Inſtitutions, I ſhall ſpeak at length on occaſion

(2) Id. ibid. (3) Socr. l. 7. c. 13.

painted [t]. In the Year 820, Pope *Paſcal* I. cauſed his Body to be tranſlated to the Church of St. *Praxedes*. And

[t] Anaſt. p. 547.

occaſion of their being firſt taken by the Popes into their Service. The *Nitrian* Monks, in the Service of *Cyril*, having ſurrounded the Governor's Chariot, firſt diſperſed, with ſeveral Vollies of Stones, the ſmall Guard that attended it, then falling upon him, dangerouſly wounded him, and ſeemed determined to put an End to the Quarrel between him and *Cyril*, by putting an End to his Life. But the Citizens, alarmed at his Danger, flew to his Reſcue, put the cowardly Monks to flight at their Firſt Appearance, and having ſeized on the Monk *Ammonius*, by whom *Oreſtes* had been wounded, delivered him into his Hands. The Governor to deter others from the like Attempts, and to mortify *Cyril*, whom he well knew to be at the Bottom of the Plot, cauſed the Monk to be tortured with ſo much Severity, that he expired on the Rack. But *Cyril*, partly out of Spite to the Governor, and partly to reward the Zeal, which the Monk had exerted in attempting to aſſaſſinate his Antagoniſt, cauſed him to be honoured as a holy Martyr, under the Name of *Thaumaſius*, being himſelf aſhamed to pay him that Honour under the Name of *Ammonius* (4).

The Partiſans of *Cyril*, alike mortified and enraged at the Death of *Ammonius*, reſolved, at all Events, to revenge it; and the Perſon they ſingled out among the Friends of *Oreſtes* to wreak their Rage and Revenge on, was one, who, of all the Inhabitants of that populous City, deſerved it the leaſt. This was the famous, and ſo much celebrated, *Hypatia*, the Wonder of her Age for Beauty, Virtue, and Knowlege. She kept a public School of Philoſophy in *Alexandria*, where ſhe was born; and her Reputation was ſo great, that not only Diſciples flocked from all Parts to hear her; but the greateſt Philoſophers uſed to conſult her, as an Oracle, with reſpect to the moſt intricate and abſtruſe Points of Aſtronomy, Geometry, and the *Platonic* Philoſophy, which ſhe was particularly well verſed in (5). Although ſhe was very beautiful, and freely converſed with Men of all Ranks, yet thoſe ſhe converſed with were ſo awed by her known Virtue and Modeſty, that none, but one of her own Diſciples, ever preſumed to ſhew in her Preſence the leaſt Symptom of Paſſion or Tenderneſs; and him ſhe ſoon cured (6). *Oreſtes* entertained the higheſt Opinion of her Abilities, often conſulted her, as the other Governors had done before him, and in all perplext Caſes governed

(4) Socr. l. 7. c. 14. (5) Soc. Ibid. Theophan. p. 70, 71. Suid. p. 976, 977. (6) Socr. et Suid. ibid.

And it is still worshiped both there and in the Cathedral of *Mantua* [u].

Thus

[u] Boll. Apr. 6.

governed himself by her Advice. As she was the Person in *Alexandria*, whom he most valued, and in whose Company he took the greatest Delight, the Friends of *Cyril*, to wound him in the most tender and sensible Part, entered into a Conspiracy to destroy the innocent Lady, and by her Death deprive him of that Comfort. This barbarous Resolution being taken, as she was one Day returning Home in her Chariot, a Band of the Dregs of the People, encouraged and headed by one of *Cyril*'s Ecclesiastics named *Peter*, attacked her in her Chariot, pulled her violently out of it, and throwing her on the Ground, dragged her to the great Church called *Cæsareum*. There they stript her naked, and with sharp Tiles, either brought with them, or found there, continued cutting, mangling, and tearing her Flesh, she bearing it with the greatest Firmness and Constancy, until Nature yielding to Pain, she expired under their Hands. Her Death did not satisfy their Rage and Fury. They tore her Body in Pieces, dragged her mangled Limbs, with a thousand Outrages, through all the Streets of *Alexandria*, and then, gathering them together, burnt them in a Place called *Cineron* (7). Such was the End of the famous *Hypatia*, the most learned Person of the Age she lived in, and one of the best, although not a Christian. Who could believe Christians, nay, Ecclesiastics, not to say Bishops, capable in those early Times of such Barbarities? The Account which I have given from *Socrates* of the tragical End of *Hypatia*, is confirmed by *Damascius* in his Life of *Isidorus* the Philosopher, written towards the End of the present Century (8). He maketh *Cyril* the Author of that barbarous Murder. But *Damascius*, say *Du Pin* and *Tillemont*, was a Pagan, and therefore deserveth no Credit. I wish it could not be made out so easily as it may, that although a Pagan he deserveth to be credited on this Occasion. The Mob was headed, in perpetrating that horrid Murder, by one of *Cyril*'s Ecclesiastics; and I do not find, that he was ever punished, or even reprimanded, by his Bishop, on that Score. When the Emperor was first acquainted by *Orestes* with what had happened, he expressed the greatest Indignation, and a firm Resolution to punish the Offenders with the utmost Severity. But *Edesius*, a Deacon of the Church of *Alexandria*, who resided at *Constantinople*, with the Character of *Cyril*'s Nuncio, having gained over the Ministers, with the large Sums that were remitted to him (not by the Mob, or the Ecclesiastic who headed them; for he was only a Reader), the Emperor was not only appeased, but prevailed upon to grant a general Pardon to all, who were concerned

(7) Socr. l. 7. c. 4. (8) Suid. p. 977.

Thus far the Hiſtory of the Popes hath been merely Eccleſiaſtical, and therefore leſs entertaining: but in the next Volume, the Affairs of the Church will begin very ſoon to be ſo interwoven with thoſe of the State, as to render the Hiſtory both Eccleſiaſtic and Civil. The Popes will ſoon make a very different Figure from that which they have hitherto made; no longer mere Biſhops, but Biſhops and Princes; and the Biſhop almoſt entirely loſt in the Prince; no longer contending only with their Collegues for Spiritual Power and Juriſdiction, but, at the ſame time, with the greateſt Monarchs for Dominion and Empire; nay, employing the Sword as well as the Keys, and heading, as directed by their Ambition or Intereſt, both Councils and Armies. We ſhall ſee the Weſtern Empire utterly extinct, and *Italy* ſucceſſively invaded, and partly held, by the *Heruli*, by the *Goths*, by the *Greeks*, the *Lombards*, the *French*, the *Italians*, the *Germans*, and the *Normans*; and the Popes managing their Affairs, in all theſe Revolutions, with ſo much Art and Addreſs, as to reap

concerned in that Riot (9). But, by pardoning them, he drew down Vengeance from Heaven upon himſelf, ſayeth the Hiſtorian, and was deſervedly puniſhed in the Perſons of thoſe, who were moſt dear to him (10). He alludeth perhaps to the unhappy End of *Valentinian* III. his Couſin and Son-in-law, who was murdered on the 17th of *March* 455, and to the Misfortunes, which the whole Imperial Family was involved in after his Death.

The Church of *Rome*, which hath ſainted this Man, may think herſelf concerned in Honour to juſtify all his Proceedings; but ſurely the Church of *England* is not. I ſhall not therefore attempt ſuch a Vindication; but, having truly and faithfully related the Facts from a cotemporary Hiſtorian, ſhall leave the Character of *Cyril* to be judged of from them, and content myſelf with wiſhing, that one, whoſe Zeal for the Chriſtian Religion was ſometimes meritorious, had better underſtood the true Bounds of that Zeal, and the true Spirit of that Religion, than he appeareth to have done upon many Occaſions.

(9) Suid. p. 977. Socr. ibid. (10) Socr. ibid.

reap, from most of them, some considerable Advantage for themselves. Events more interesting, although, in reality, not more important, than those which the present Volume relateth; and which, to the very End of this History, will be succeeded by others, equally proper to excite the Attention even of such Readers as seek for Amusement alone.

The END *of the* FIRST VOLUME.